

Three Debates about Bible and Archaeology

For almost twenty-five years, three significant, enmeshed and confusingly lengthy debates bearing on the accuracy and truthfulness of historical narratives in the Hebrew Bible have resounded in universities and denominational seminaries. Other than the most religiously conservative scholars who may be uninformed or who chose to ignore these goings-on in the academic study of ancient Israel, few who study or teach or preach on the topics lack an opinion. The Biblical Archaeology debate, the Minimalist-Maximalist debate, and the Tenth Century debate, have kept scholars busy correcting history lectures, writing articles and trying to keep their theology attuned with their understanding of history.

In academic circles and then through the press and many publications in the popular, widely circulated *Biblical Archaeology Review*, each debate came to be associated with an individual: first, the 'Biblical Archaeology' debate with W.G. Dever of the University of Arizona in the United States; second, the 'minimalist-maximalist' debate with P.R. Davies of Sheffield University in England; and finally, the 'Tenth Century' with I. Finkelstein of Tel-Aviv University in Israel. Each of these individuals is known as a competent scholar, an energetic and voluminous writer, an engaging speaker, and a skillful rhetorician.

Liverani's dispassionate description of the issues raised in the debates illustrates well the pall that they have cast over the study of what he calls 'the history of Biblical Israel'. Questioning both theoretical and practical issues in the historiographic enterprise, some scholars have successfully undermined confidence in the validity of most historical interpretations as well as in the ability of historians to even determine what constitutes a datum or an event relevant to that past the historians must explain⁽¹⁾. Liverani's article suggests to me that their effectiveness has been due largely, or partially, to the confluence of the three into a single Bible and Archaeology debate. My objectives in this article are to disentangle issues beclouded by fuzzy terminology by considering each of the three in its unique

⁽¹⁾ M. LIVERANI, "Nuovi sviluppi nello studio della storia dell'Israele biblico", *Bib* 80 (1999) 490-492, 497-500, 502-505.

intellectual context, and to indicate how this approach promotes an intellectually healthy climate within which historical research may advance.

I. The 'Biblical Archaeology' Debate

The 'Biblical Archaeology' debate, provoked by Dever in the 1970's, was about whether 'Biblical Archaeology' might be better termed 'Syro-Palestinian Archaeology' ⁽²⁾. Good reasons were elicited in favor of the change and it had much support among professional archaeologists and archaeological cognoscenti.

(1) Archeologists generally use adjectives referring to a period (e.g., Chalcolithic, Middle Bronze) and/or geographical region (e.g., Babylonian, Egyptian) and/or culture (e.g., Hittite, Roman) to describe the focus of their work; never an adjectivized book title. There is neither 'Beowulf Archeology' nor 'Illiadic Archaeology'. In archaeological parlance, 'Biblical' was a vacuous word.

(2) Individuals employing the expression intended 'Biblical' to refer primarily to the historical periods during which personages mentioned in the Bible lived in the 'Biblical world'. This latter term, became widely used in American scholarship under the influence of W.F. Albright, broadly recognized as the founding scholar of scientific Biblical archaeology in the land of Israel. As Albright used 'Biblical Archaeology', it encompassed all countries and cultures of the Middle East mentioned in the Bible or relevant to events portrayed there. Excavations in Spain and Syria, Tunisia and Arabia could be classified under its rubric. Used this way, 'Biblical' blanketed too much territory and was, as a result, not informative.

(3) 'Biblical' refers to nothing that archaeologists do as archaeologists, i.e., as experts in excavating, cataloguing finds, tracing the development and evolution of material culture.

⁽²⁾ W.G. DEVER, *Archaeology and Biblical Studies*. Retrospects and Prospects (Archeologia 4.1; Evanston 1974) 17-25, 34-43; ID., "Retrospects and Prospects in Biblical and Syro-Palestinian Archaeology", *BA* 45 (1982) 103-107; H. SHANKS, "Should the Term 'Biblical Archaeology' Be Abandoned?" *BARE* 7/3 (1981) 54-57; E.F. CAMPBELL, "Letter to Readers", *BA* 45 (1982) 68; H.D. LANCE, "American Biblical Archaeology in Perspective", *BA* 45 (1982) 97-101. Dever first introduced the term as referring to an 'independent, secular discipline ... pursued by cultural historians for its own sake' in the "Introduction" to *Biblical Archaeology* (ed. S.M. PAUL – W.G. DEVER) (Library of Jewish knowledge; Jerusalem 1973) ix. (I thank Prof. Paul for this reference.)

In view of these sound reasons, it appears puzzling that Dever's reasonable case failed to carry the day. There were three major types of objections to it: the first, institutional, reflecting enlightened self-interest; the second, semantic; and the third, by far the most complex, theological.

Institutional objections: Most full-time archaeologists from the United States and virtually all from Europe and Israel were inclined to favor Dever's suggestion; Biblicists and theologians, however, were divided. Furthermore, the overwhelming majority of excavators interested in Biblical periods who work in Israel and Jordan were not full-time archaeologists. Most are employed at seminaries or denominational institutions where they teach Bible or courses with names like 'Ancient Israelite Civilization' and the like. They were reluctant to adopt and promote terminology suggesting that archaeology was irrelevant to their work as Biblicists. Furthermore, the terminology proposed by Dever might have fostered perceptions of archaeology inimical to their tasks of procuring financial support from generous patrons and granting institutions and of recruiting individual volunteers for digs.

Semantic objections (or justifications): Among those who recognized the essential validity of Dever's concerns, many wished to maintain the term 'Biblical Archaeology'. They argued on Albrightian grounds that it was both useful and meaningful when referring to Iron Age archaeology in Israel and Jordan. 'Biblical archaeology' was appropriate because although it alluded to canonical scripture, the collocation was commonly understood as referring to a particular people in a particular place and time: Israelites in the Land of Israel from the Iron Age until the days of Ezra and Nehemiah in the Persian period which followed the Iron Age, i.e., c. 1200-332 BCE (when the referent of 'Biblical' was the Hebrew Bible). It could even cover Jesus, Paul and the early church (when the referent was the New Testament). With this sense, it resembled terms such as 'Roman' or 'Greek' applied as adjectives to branches of classical archaeology. Consequently, the debate was just so much semantic quibbling. Finally, there was no valid reason to eliminate the adjective 'Biblical'. Just as ancient written sources are used by classical archaeologists when interpreting their finds, the Bible is used in interpreting finds from Iron Age Israel.

Theological objections I: Complicating this delicate situation was the fact, generally unknown to people who came of age after the 1950's, that 'Biblical Archaeology' was an old term, well established

in Biblical studies since the early nineteenth century, whose general sense was transparent to all. For example, in 1839, *Jahn's Biblical Archaeology* began to provide generations of American seminarians and clergy the following definition:

Archaeology ... considered subjectively ... is the knowledge of whatever in antiquity is worthy of remembrance, but objectively is that knowledge reduced to a system ... in a limited sense has special reference to religious and civil institutions, to opinions, manners and customs and the like ⁽³⁾.

Jahn's book, first published in German in 1802, assumed this archaeological agenda and illustrated what it could accomplish using the Bible itself as its primary source and resource, but also ancient monuments, coins, the writings of Philo, Josephus, Rabbinic and some Patristic literature, and journals of travelers. For Jahn, archaeology could be done in the scholar's study. It was simply a matter of word study and philological analysis.

The conservative exegete Keil noted that Jahn had simply borrowed his comprehension of 'archaeology' from Greek usage attested in sources as diverse as Plato, Dionysius of Halicarnassus, and Josephus and applied it to the Bible⁽⁴⁾. For his own *Handbuch der biblischen Archäologie* published in 1858, Keil adopted a somewhat different definition:

By Biblical archaeology or knowledge of antiquity we mean the scientific representation of the way of life of the Israelite people as the only nation of antiquity that God had selected as bearer of revelations recorded in the Bible.

This knowledge, according to Keil, excluded history *per se*, but included physical geography, religious institutions such as places of worship, personnel, rituals, and calendar; social institutions such as houses, food, clothing; family institutions and organizations and

⁽³⁾ J. Jahn (1750-1816) published an original five volume *Biblische Archäologie* in 1802. He abridged this publication into a one volume J. JAHN, *Archaeologia biblica in Epitomen redacta* (Vienna 1814), latter translated as ID., *Archaeologia Biblica*. A manual of biblical antiquities (Andover 1823) by the the American poet and translator T.C. Upham from the Latin. His translation was reprinted with additions and corrections under the shorter title *Jahn's Biblical Archaeology* until 1853. The quotation is from an 1839 edition published in New York.

⁽⁴⁾ K.F. KEIL, *Handbuch der biblischen Archäologie* (Frankfort a. M. – Erlangen 1858-1859) 2. This book came out in a second German edition in 1875 that was translated with Keil's additions and corrections and published as ID., *Manual of Biblical Archaeology* (Edinburgh 1887-1888) I-II.

concerns, and civil organizations such as law, courts, army, etc. The significance of this archaeology was to set forth the objective distinctiveness of Israel as a witness to revelation, but 'the method of description must be historical in keeping with the historical character of Biblical revelation' ⁽⁵⁾.

In 1896, Lansing published a slim book, *Outlines of the Archaeology of the Old Testament* in which he listed archaeology as a branch of exegetical theology. He wrote: 'Biblical Archaeology is the science of sacred *things* as over against sacred words' (emphasis in the original). The 'things' included the same subjects treated by Keil along with the antiquities of other nations 'so far as these have any direct bearing on any passage of Scripture' ⁽⁶⁾. In this volume, the direct connection between 'thing' and exegesis is emphasized, history in general left somewhat aside.

Even as the first volume of Jahn's first German edition was being published, other European scholars were engaged in activities about to expand the meaning of 'archaeology'. In 1801, E. Clark set out to travel in the Holy Land in order to discover ancient cities and holy sites. He was followed by U.J. Seetzen in 1802, J.L. Burckhardt in 1809, and a host of others. The most famous of these, E. Robinson, Professor of Bible at Union Theological Seminary in New York, first traveled there in 1839.

Basing himself on geographical lists and casual references to places in the Bible, blessed with a gifted ear for discerning ancient Hebrew and Greek place names in local Arabic guise, and possessed of a fine sense of topography, Robinson, travelling with his former student Eli Smith, an Arabic-speaking missionary, discovered, recorded, and mapped hundreds of sites, many uninhabited for more than 2000 years. His literate, engaging three volume book published in 1841, *Biblical Researches in Palestine, the Sinai, Petrae and Adjacent Regions* became a widely read best-seller ⁽⁷⁾. Robinson demonstrated the possibility of identifying many of the sites mentioned in the Bible,

⁽⁵⁾ KEIL, *Handbuch*, 1-5.

⁽⁶⁾ J.G. LANSING, *Outlines of the Archaeology of the Old Testament* (New Brunswick 1896) 4-5.

⁽⁷⁾ P.J. KING, *American Archaeology in the Mideast. A History of the American Schools of Oriental Research* (Philadelphia 1983) 3-4; C.C. LAMBERG-KARLOVSKY, *Beyond the Tigris and Euphrates* (Beersheba 1996) 26-29. Indeed, most of the travelers published either popular or scientific accounts of their travels, so that information about the Holy Land and the Bible was widely circulated in English, French, and German.

and by implication the accuracy and trustworthiness of the Bible. His work was taken as indicating that scientific research, the same research that could discover extinct animals, cavemen, and distant planets could verify Biblical facts.

In 1890, Petrie, an English scholar with more than 20 years of experience excavating in Egypt, launched the first scientific excavation in the Holy Land at Tell el-Hesi. Soon after, excavations were undertaken at Gezer, Jericho, and in Shechem. In 1906, German excavations were undertaken at Megiddo, the site of Armageddon.

Between 1870 and the 1930's, after Schliemann excavated Troy and with a publicist's sure sense of audience claimed to have authenticated Homer's stories, an excited popular audience hungered for additional historical conclusions from excavations in Egypt, Mesopotamia, and Palestine.

In perusing books and booklets with titles approximating 'Biblical Archaeology' written from the late nineteenth through the early twentieth century, I noticed how their contents differed from Jahn's, reflecting a semantic drift in the term 'archaeology' over 50 years⁽⁸⁾. In these, the difference between 'archaeology' and 'history' seems to have been that 'history' referred to knowledge of past political events, in accord with the Rankian program for history writing that evolved in Germany c. 1825-1850. 'Archaeology' referred more to the *realia* and processes of daily life⁽⁹⁾. Knowledge gained from 'dirt archaeology' was included with the *realia*. It produced information that clarified philological archaeology and was applied likewise to illustrate and background Biblical historical narratives, all of which were considered accurate descriptions. To the extent that I am able to discern, the twenty-five or so books examined were all written by Biblicists, individuals involved in the study, exegesis and theological explication of scripture.

What changed over 170 years, from the time that Jahn published his first volume until the emergence of the debate, was the content of the term 'archaeology'. The new meaning replaced the old in popular

⁽⁸⁾ I observed what was available in the stacks of the library at Princeton Theological Seminary in August and November, 2000. Due to a shortage of books with the required two words, I included books whose titles indicated that they were dealing with similar types of data.

⁽⁹⁾ Cf. E. KALT, *Biblische Archäologie* (Freiburg 1924), a short volume focusing on political, religious and social institutions in their geographical setting. Although written more than 60 years after Keil — it could be considered an updated abridgement of the earlier work — Kalt did not incorporate findings from dirt archaeology into his discussions.

parlance, but *continued to coexist with it in denominational settings* in the frozen term ‘Biblical Archeology’ along with the understanding of how such ‘Biblical Archeology’ was to be used in Bible study.

Although unremarked upon in scholarly literature and in public discussions, some of Dever’s critics were simply unwilling to ignore part of the semantic field of ‘archaeology’. Considering ‘Biblical archaeology’ a perfectly good term with a long tradition in Biblical studies, ministerial training, and Christian education, they were not particularly bothered by issues raised by Dever and may have considered his call for change much ado about little.

Theological Objections II: By the 1950’s, under the influence of Albright, ‘Biblical Archaeology’ had come to include under its rubric studies of the Ugaritic literary texts as well as the newly discovered Dead Sea Scrolls among which were the oldest known biblical manuscripts. These two discoveries from the chronological limits of the Biblical period shed crucial light on the cultural background and literary history of ancient Israel and on the textual history of the Bible; consequently, they were thought to illustrate the Bible’s historical accuracy in some vague, undefined way. Similarly, the physical presence of excavated objects, such as small altars similar to the tabernacle altar described in the Bible, figurines taken to be examples of images prohibited in Biblical legislation, and material evidence for sequences of events such as the destruction of a Canaanite city at the beginning of the Iron Age, were taken as mute testimony to the accuracy of what the Bible ‘said’ about them in Deuteronomy, Joshua and Judges.

Conservative scholars in particular, but liberal scholars as well, assumed that if archeology could demonstrate that something might have occurred, that was proof sufficient that it had occurred if the Bible so indicated⁽¹⁰⁾. The halo effect of such ‘Bible is true’ thinking in combination with the conception of ‘Biblical Archaeology’ as a handmaiden of exegesis continued to extend the authenticating implications of dirt archaeology from particular details about *realia* to features of non-material culture such as history, historiography, and theology⁽¹¹⁾.

⁽¹⁰⁾ Cf. KING, *American Archaeology in the Mideast*, 83, regarding the approach of M. Kyle, a conservative Biblicist long associated with W.F. Albright and American archaeology in the Holy Land.

⁽¹¹⁾ See J.C. MEYER – V.H. MATTHEWS, “The Use and Abuse of Archaeology in Current Bible Handbooks”, *BA* 48 (1985) 149-159; ID., “The Use and Abuse of Archaeology in Current One-volume Bible Dictionaries”, *BA* 48 (1985) 222-237.

This testimony became grist for the mills of the liberal, positivistic ‘Biblical Theology’ movement that achieved great popularity starting in the 1950’s and has had a profound influence on what has been taught subsequently in both Christian and non-Orthodox, Jewish settings since then. What distinguished this movement from more conservative approaches was its ability to discern a difference between the reliability and accuracy of the Bible’s historical descriptions as tested by archaeological investigations and the theological predications of the text⁽¹²⁾. Predications were raised to prominence as ‘proclamation’ while events tested and not found wanting were esteemed as witnesses to the proclamation. Events found wanting, such as the enslavement of Israelites in Egypt, were classified as ‘myth’, their lack of historicity ignored, and they were milked for their kerygmatic predications alone.

In proposing the term ‘Syro-Palestinian archaeology’, Dever explicitly declared that he had given up on the term with its associative links to exegesis and theological explication. He may have been perceived as attacking religion. He certainly was perceived correctly as attacking those arguing from denominationally normative (or Biblical) theology to archaeological interpretation. But, to the best of my knowledge, he did not raise this as a general issue in public presentations.

Dever lost the debate. It was almost inevitable. There are many more teachers of Bible in the world than there are archaeologists working in the Iron Age period, and the overwhelming majority of these teachers work in denominational settings with explicit and implicit theological programs that are *a priori* to whatever archaeologists might discover. The call for a change in terminology was intended to sever the connection between the archaeological and the theological, to disallow any claims that archaeology of the physical had implications for the metaphysical, and to delegitimize any interpretative authority that theologically driven Biblicists might claim over archaeological data.

Many of the abuses sighted and cited by these authors address the older, traditional use of archaeological material in denominational settings.

(¹²) This description is borrowed from Weaver who used it to suggest how the historical impasse caused by archaeology might be addressed theologically in the 1990’s; cf. W.P. WEAVER, “The Archaeology of Palestine and the Archaeology of Faith: Between a Rock and a Hard Place”, *What has Archaeology to do with Faith?* (eds. J.H. CHARLESWORTH – W P. WEAVER) (Faith and Scholarship Colloquies; Philadelphia 1992) 89-105 (“The Failure of Archaeology as an Apologetic Strategy”).

By the late 1980's, after the decline of Bible Theology as a dynamic and aggressive movement, the situation sorted itself out in the following manner. 'Syro-Palestinian' archaeology became a broadly accepted term referring to a discipline that usually requires either a combination of postgraduate training and a few seasons of field and lab experience or many seasons of field and lab experience and relevant publications. It remains restricted to professional circles and has become the term of preference in departments of archaeology, anthropology and history. 'Biblical Archaeology' evolved into a term used primarily in popular culture, in titles of public lecture, magazine articles, books, and undergraduate or seminary courses. The term came to signal that both textual and archaeological matters would be dealt with in presentations with this title, but not the proportion of archaeology to text and not the professional orientation of the author or lecturer. Considering that all Syro-Palestinian archaeologists working in certain historical periods must of needs exploit information in the Bible when interpreting some of their finds, they are *ipso facto* Biblical archaeologists; but, not all Biblicists using archeological information who may fashion themselves 'Biblical archaeologists' can claim to be 'Syro-Palestinian archaeologists'. Even Dever made his peace with this situation⁽¹³⁾.

As imperceptible as it was in the 1980's, the debate had precipitated changes beyond professional terminology. It had disseminated the notion that the Albrightian synthesis of Biblical studies and archaeology no longer maintained its integrity: Biblicists could go it alone as could archaeologists. In Biblical studies there was a turning away from historical analyses to literary ones; in Iron Age archaeology, a turning from historical explanations of excavation data based Biblical historiography toward political-economic interpretations based on social-anthropological theories. Some Biblicists accepting Dever's distinction undertook social histories of Israel based on a mix of archaeological data and social-anthropological theory.

II. The Minimalist-Maximalist Debate

The Minimalist-Maximalist debate was fomented in 1992 when Davies published a small, widely read polemic, *In Search of Ancient Israel*, propounding a particularly stingy evaluation of the historical

⁽¹³⁾ W.G. DEVER, "What Archaeology Can Contribute to an Understanding of the Bible", *BARe* 7/5 (1981) 40-41; ID., "Archaeology and the Bible. Understanding Their Special Relationship", *BARe* 16/3 (1990) 52-58, 62.

worth of information in the Bible about ancient Israel⁽¹⁴⁾. The same year Thompson published a book reaching similar conclusions⁽¹⁵⁾, and the debate ensued.

As a group, minimalists are associated with the University of Sheffield in England and the University of Copenhagen in Denmark, but they appear to be more influential in the United States than in England and on the Continent. Although Davies is the best known, there are only about a half-dozen productive scholars advancing minimalist arguments regularly in papers and articles, and about two or three times that many doing so infrequently. Much maligned by Biblicists and historians, I consider minimalists to be engaged in a legitimate historical undertaking up to a point.

Contemporary historians, minimalists included, distinguish (1) between a past world where things happened and the narrative representation of that world in ancient writings and (2), between elements in the historiosophical view that contributed to the formation of a particular narrative about the past, the descriptive adequacy of the same narrative in its original literary and historical contexts, and its adequacy for the work of a contemporary historian. The launch point for minimalist positions is determined by their answers to questions that all (good) historians are trained to ask about any written documents: What is the nature of this document? Who wrote it? Who benefits from this document? When was it written and why? Where was it written?

Minimalists allow that the Hebrew Bible is a constitutional document for the Jewish people and that the earliest time when features characteristic of that which is recognizably late Second

⁽¹⁴⁾ P.R. DAVIES, *In Search of Ancient Israel* (JSOTSS 266; Sheffield 1992). Actually, Davies was partially anticipated by N.P. LEMCHE, *Early Israel. Anthropological and Historical Studies on the Israelite Society Before the Monarchy* (VTS 37; Leiden 1985). Lemche's book, however, did not generate the furor and spark the debate. Subsequent to the characterization of these scholars as 'minimalists', he was associated and associated himself with them. G. GARBINI, *History and Ideology in Ancient Israel* (New York 1988) 1-20, 125-126, 132, 154-169, anticipated the minimalists in attacking theological interpretations of history that countenanced the theologizing historiography of the Biblical texts as historical statements and in dating Biblical compositions to the Persian and Hellenistic periods. His pugnacious essays, published in English translation two years after appearing in Italian, have not become part of the minimalist conversation.

⁽¹⁵⁾ T.L. THOMPSON, *Early History of the Israelite People. From the Written and Archaeological Sources* (SHNE 4; Leiden 1992).

Temple Judaism, such as the importance of reading the Torah publicly and observing its charges faithfully, abstention from work and commerce on the Sabbath, avoiding intermarriage, tithing, maintaining Temple sacrifice through a self-imposed tax (cf. Neh 10,30-40), appear is during the Persian period. Then, Ezra and Nehemiah — both Jewish, both empowered by the Persian court at different times during the fifth century BCE to determine civil and religious policy — wielded power in Jerusalem. They also determine, on the basis of their reading of Ezra and Nehemiah, that the population of Yehud, the Persian province centered around Jerusalem, contained a large admixture of foreigners, forcibly settled in the area as a result of ancient Near Eastern politics.

Posing the abovementioned historian's questions about the Bible in this socio-historical setting, minimalists conclude that the books of the Hebrew Bible were written during the Persian (or Hellenistic) period. The historical books actually contain made-up stories (that may have exploited some vague, ancient legends) through which the local organized refugee population provided itself with a mythic cover-(hi)story that linked it to the land and to a religion. This conclusion has two important corollaries: (1) Bible narratives about the political, social, and intellectual world of ancient Israel from Abraham to the temple's destruction lack probative value. (2) Any narrative about what actually happened to the real people living in the central mountain areas of ancient Israel during what archaeologists call the Iron Age must, accordingly, be based on archaeological data alone. No other authentic sources for their history are available.

Lending credulity to minimalists is a broad consensus among liberal students of the Bible and archaeologists that no archaeological data or any data external to the Bible itself confirm the patriarchal or exodus stories as narrated in Genesis and Exodus. The same consensus recognizes that only with some fine tweaking and very qualified explanations can archaeological data be drafted to support *some* elements in the Joshua-Judges narratives. Finally, the consensus maintains that the proto-historical and the epic exodus-conquest narratives, whether truthful or not, were first set down in writing between the ninth and sixth centuries BCE on the basis of oral traditions, ancient but unverifiable. For narratives about events that occurred after the ninth century, however, Israelite writers had access to court and temple records so that more credibility adheres to their contents. There is no consensus, however, about the time of the *final editing* of the historical books. Some argue for the late exilic period

c. 600-580 BCE; others for the exilic, Neo-Babylonian period, 586-538 BCE; and still others for the post-exilic, Persian period, 538-332 BCE.

Thus, so far as these different periods are concerned, the only differences between the minimalists and most other historians is the date assigned for the *composition* of the stories and narratives and their evaluation of the amount of 'real history' embedded in them⁽¹⁶⁾. These differences have far reaching implications.

Minimalists go beyond the historical-critical consensus in arguing that the complete history, from Abraham to Moses to Joshua to David and Solomon and the other kings is all cut from the same cloth for the same reason. The people Israel, its leaders and heroes are literary fictions or inventions or constructs. Stories about them, their victories, defeats, religious policies are all late concoctions written at the earliest in the Persian period. Historical Israel, the actual flesh and blood people who dwelt in the central mountains during the Iron Ages, didn't come from Egypt. They were descendents of earlier, Bronze Age inhabitants of the places where they lived. Their culture and religion was a slightly evolved form of the earlier, Bronze Age Canaanite ones⁽¹⁷⁾.

This set of axioms and derivative corollaries is encapsulated in the minimalist distinction between a 'Biblical Israel', created by literati of the Persian period and preserved in the Hebrew Bible, a 'historical Israel', that actually lived in the central hill country of the Land of Israel during the Iron Age about which very little is knowable, and an 'ancient Israel', the scholarly 'construct' of people enthralled by Bible stories, hamstrung by theological teachings based on the combination of the first two, and by individuals overly involved with 'Biblical Archaeology' ⁽¹⁸⁾.

⁽¹⁶⁾ P.R. DAVIES, "What Separates a Minimalist from a Maximalist? Not Much", *BARe* 26/2 (2000) 24-27, 72-73.

⁽¹⁷⁾ Models of cultural evolution and diffusion became popular in much historical and archaeological explanation during the 1970s and remains so. Their application reflects the trend to reject explanations of change in ancient populations through recourse to theories of invasions and migrations. Scholars felt that the changes might be better explained as due to ordered socio-archaeological processes operating on the indigenous, local population. Cf. J. CHAPMAN – H. HAMEROW, "On the Move Again — Migrations and Invasions in Archaeological Explanations", *Migrations and Invasions in Archaeological Explanation* (eds. J. CHAPMAN – H. HAMEROW) (BAR.IS 664; Oxford 1997) 1; and the new migration research presented in *Migration, Migration History, History. Old Paradigms and New Perspectives* (eds. J. LUCASSEN – L. LUCASSEN) (Bern 1999).

⁽¹⁸⁾ DAVIES, *In Search of Ancient Israel*, 11-14.

After commenting on the deficiencies of all non-minimalist scholarship, Lemche who has assumed the role of philosophical and methodological spokesperson for minimalism writes:

The conclusion that historical-critical scholarship is based on a false methodology and leads to false conclusions simply means that we can disregard 200 years of bible scholarship and commit it to the dustbin. It is hardly worth the paper on which it is printed ⁽¹⁹⁾.

Contrary to what their detractors believe, minimalists take the historical writings seriously. Given their conclusions concerning the late date of authorship and the lack of historicity, their attempts to explain why the stories were written as they appear and to what purpose constitute a valid and necessary undertaking. Maximalists, however, disparage the minimalist narrative, arguing that its base conclusions remain undemonstrated assertions and that sufficient evidence disproves the hypotheses underlying them.

Minimalism has at least five sets of intellectual roots: (1) conclusions about when most books were written that were accepted by liberal Protestant scholars at the end of the nineteenth century ⁽²⁰⁾; (2) the employment of socio-anthropological models of how societies evolve and tell stories about themselves that were popularized in Biblical studies during the 1970's by Gottwald's studies of Israelite

⁽¹⁹⁾ N.P. LEMCHE, "On the Problems of Reconstructing Pre-Hellenistic Israelite (Palestinian) History", *Journal of Hebrew Scriptures* (<http://purl.org/jhs>) 3 (2000) pars. 4.2.

⁽²⁰⁾ Arguments dating the final edition of the Pentateuch, most historical writings, the final edition of the Prophetic literature, psalms, and proverbs of the Hebrew Bible to different parts of the Persian and Hellenistic periods were prominent at the end of the nineteenth century. They were influenced greatly by judgments of Kuenen and Wellhausen after K.H. Graf presented what were then considered strong sound arguments for the post-exilic dating of the Priestly source; cf. A. KUENEN, *An Historico-Critical Inquiry into the Origin and Composition of the Hexateuch* (London 1886 [trans. from the 2nd Dutch ed. of 1885]) 313-321; J. WELLHAUSEN, *Prolegomena to the History of Ancient Israel* (New York 1957 [repr. of 1885; transl. from the 2nd German ed. of 1883]) 13. These 19th century comprehensions maintained themselves in Continental scholarship with increasing sophistication, but appear to have had little influence on English or American scholars; cf. H. BOUILLARD-BONRAISON, "Les livres bibliques d'époque perse", *La Palestine à l'époque perse* (ed. E.M. LAPEROUSAZ) (Études annexes de la Bible de Jérusalem; Paris 1994) 157-188; B. GOSSE, *Structuration des grands ensembles bibliques et intertextualité à l'époque perse*. De la rédaction sacerdotale du livre d'Isaïe à la contestation de la Sagesse (BZAW 246; Berlin 1997).

society in general and the emergence of ancient Israel from Canaanite groups resident in the central hill country in particular⁽²¹⁾; (3) evaluations of archaeological data that since the 1950's question, qualify or deny the historicity of the exodus and conquest narratives and that since the 1970's-80's deny that of the patriarchal traditions⁽²²⁾; (4) a strategy for reading Biblical historical narrative against the grain similar to the Deconstruction strategies developed by J. Derrida emulated widely in departments of literature and history during the 1970's and 1980's; (5) the climate of extreme skepticism, a skepticism sometimes bordering on cynicism characteristic of much Western historical analysis since the late 1960's⁽²³⁾.

Although minimalist claims are derived through reasoning processes practiced by contemporary historians, they shocked Biblical scholarship by their boldness and in their assignment of Biblical

(21) Cf. his summary study, N.K. GOTTWALD, *The Tribes of Yahweh. A Sociology of the Religion of Liberated Israel, 1250-1050 B.C.E.* (Maryknoll 1979). Gottwald himself refined ideas initially introduced by G. MENDENHALL, "The Hebrew Conquest of Palestine", *BA* 25 (1962) 66-87, providing them with a theoretical basis in socio-anthropological models.

(22) Concerning the conquest and settlement, see G.E. WRIGHT, "The Literary and Historical Problem of Josh 10 and Ju 1", *JNES* 5 (1946) 105-114; J. BRIGHT, *A History of Israel* (Philadelphia 1959) 110-127, presented an Albrightian-Wrightian synthesis of data even as the archaeological evidence for the conquest and settlement is described muddily as 'not at all points unambiguous' (*ibid.*, 118). More recent work that minimalists, but not only minimalists, consider to have solved the problem adequately contends that there was no conquest and no settlement. It gives up completely on employing Biblical narratives in any meaningful way for a historical synthesis because they are felt to be incompatible with the hard archaeological evidence. Cf. I. FINKELSTEIN, *The Archaeology of the Israelite Settlement* (Jerusalem 1988); *id.*, "The Emergence of Early Israel: Anthropology, Environment, and Archaeology", *JAOS* 110 (1990) 677-686.

Concerning the Patriarchs, see T.L. THOMPSON, *The Historicity of the Patriarchal Period* (BZAW 113; Berlin 1974); and J. VAN SETERS, *Abraham in History and Tradition* (New Haven 1975). Claims that extra-biblical data supported the historicity of the patriarchal period in the Middle Bronze II or Late Bronze periods popular in the 1950's were dispatched by these two individuals working independently. Few scholars, if any, have challenged the specific conclusions of their important books. The consensus, however, may change eventually as a consequence of new data and new analyses of old data from Mari on the middle Euphrates; cf. D. FLEMING, "Mari and the Possibilities of Biblical Memory", *RA* 92 (1998) 42, 46-51, 58-59, 76.

(23) This intellectual phenomenon is described and analyzed in chap. I of my book, Z. ZEVIT, *The Religions of Ancient Israel. A Synthesis of Parallactic Approaches* (London 2001) 49-68.

historiography to the genre of apologetic mythmaking and ‘big lie’ history writing. In addition, Davies inflamed non-academic passions by attacking potential detractors in politically strategic ‘anti-political’ moves. For example, anticipating disagreement over his understanding of the intent of ancient authors in writing texts, Davies opined that his opponents introduce theological concerns to their analyses, arguing that for them reconstructing ‘ancient Israel’ is not a historical undertaking but an affirming theological one, and with regard to the way they set about engaging in their work that ‘religious commitments should not parade as scholarly methods’⁽²⁴⁾. Davies thus challenged his readers to decide if they were truly historians or believers masquerading as historians. In other words, everybody who might disagree with him was either a literary fundamentalist at worst or an unsophisticated reader at best. Furthermore, the statement suggests that the book, in some way, was written as an attack on certain types of Christian beliefs.

Anticipating that his reconstruction of history would not win favor and that regnant views about historical Israel would prevail, he cast himself as an intellectual martyr and explained the conditions which would defeat his challenge: ‘The pen is indeed mightier than the sword, fiction mightier than truth, and belief more important to human motivation than knowledge’⁽²⁵⁾. Davies’ statements comprise an attack on the intellectual integrity of those who might disagree with him. His polemical tone, assumed also by some other minimalists, induced visceral responses that were equally apodictic and largely beside the point.

Minimalism continues an element of the ‘Biblical Archaeology’ debate in Dever’s advocacy of unblinded scholarly objectivity when analyzing data bearing on ancient Israel. It has reconstructed a past historical world on the basis of Biblical texts alone. Its major

⁽²⁴⁾ DAVIES, *In Search of Ancient Israel*, 46-47 and 19, n. 4. Although this particular statement seems to distinguish Davies from elements of postmodern discourse that maintain that there are no objective truths, only subjective ideologies, within the context of discussions between Biblicists, it is a rhetorical foil that renders defense of his arguments unnecessary. His opponents are describing what minimalists call ‘historical Israel’.

⁽²⁵⁾ DAVIES, *In Search of Ancient Israel*, 161. His anticipation of rejection was realistic, given that he addressed himself to Biblicists and attacked the same audience that preserved the ‘Biblical archaeology’. N.P. LEMCHE, “Ideology and the History of Ancient Israel”, *SJOT* 14 (2000) 165-166, also describes anticipating the rejection of his ideas at the very beginning of his career for much the same reason but resolving to plunge into the fray nevertheless.

independent involvement with archaeology has been to discount, *on non-archaeological grounds*, the importance of any archaeological data that might contradict its findings. No minimalist has appropriated what little is known about the Persian period from archaeological excavation and archaeological surveys conducted in Israel since the late 1960s to support any of its particular arguments.

This tendency to deny contradictory evidence reached a sour-noted crescendo when archaeologists were accused of manufacturing inscriptions whose contents undermined minimalist assertions. At Tel Dan, fragments of a ninth century BCE Aramaic victory inscription were discovered that mentioned the 'House of David'. The find embarrassed minimalists because of their claim that David and Solomon most likely never existed, but in the event that they had indeed existed, could not have been much more than a local tribal chiefs in Jerusalem. Reference to the 'House of David' in the Dan inscription suggested that the Davidic dynasty was so well known and powerful that an Aramean king considered bragging about his success against its army worthwhile. Some minimalists accused A. Biran, director of the Hebrew Union College excavations at Dan, of having forged and planted the inscription.

Likewise, an inscription found in the Philistine city, Ekron, mentioned the names Achish, a Philistine name, Padi, a name uniquely associated with Ekron in the Bible, and the name Ekron itself. This inscription was awkward for the minimalist narrative because it supported the historical connectedness between these three names as reported in biblical historiography. Since it was hardly likely that people concocting a fictional history during the Persian period, as maintained by most minimalists, could have been aware of this trivial onomastic information, the existence of the inscription undermined minimalist claims about the absence of facticity in historical narratives. This time, the accusation of forgery was hurled at the two directors of the Ekron expedition: S. Gitin of the W.F. Albright Institute of Archaeology and T. Dothan of the Institute of Archaeology of the Hebrew University.

The misnamed 'maximalist' side in this debate consists of the overwhelming majority of scholars from both sides of the 'Biblical archaeology' debate on both sides of the Atlantic⁽²⁶⁾. Most maximalists

⁽²⁶⁾ The term 'maximalist' creates the false impression that this group consists of literary fundamentalists. Minimalists ended up with a better label than their opponents.

do not maintain that every event recorded in the Hebrew Bible occurred. They differ among themselves as to what in Biblical historiography reflects actual events and as to how relevant information from other disciplines bearing on the different periods of Israelite history should be used. They concur, however, that all contemporaneous extra-Biblical sources must be included in discussions of Israelite history, that minimalist super-skepticism is unwarranted, and that its descriptions of Israelite history and historiography are overly general, descriptively inadequate and often incorrect factually.

Most scholars maintain, on the basis of (1) comparative ancient Near Eastern literature and (2) comparative ancient Near Eastern historiography from more than a millennium before the Persian period, from (3) inscriptions found in Israel and in neighboring countries dated to the Iron Ages that relate to specific historical events, some even mentioning people named in the Bible, (4) from the attested evolution of the vocabulary and grammar of the Hebrew language, and (5) from a critical historical comprehension of the Persian period in Yehud, as well as on the basis of (6) archaeological data, that although most of the historical books from Joshua through Kings were written or edited at the latest in the exilic or early pre-exilic period, they do contain earlier and much earlier materials and, consequently, reflect authentic, archaic, Israelite traditions from the late monarchy, c. 922-586 BCE⁽²⁷⁾. This position allows that knowledge of 'historical Israel' and

⁽²⁷⁾ W.G. DEVER, "Save Us from Postmodern Malarkey", *BARe* 26/2 (2000) 28-35, 68-69; J. HACKETT, "Spelling Differences and Letter Shapes Are Telltale Signs", *BARe* 23/2 (1997) 42-44; R. HENDEL, "The Date of the Siloam Inscription: A Rejoinder to Rogerson and Davies", *BA* 59 (1996) 233-237; S. NORIN, "The Age of the Siloam Inscription and Hezekiah's Tunnel", *VT* 48 (1998) 37-48; A. HURVITZ, "The historical quest for 'ancient Israel' and the linguistic evidence of the Hebrew Bible: some methodological considerations", *VT* 47 (1997) 301-315; S. JAPHET, "Can the Persian Period Bear the Burden? Reflections on the Origins of Biblical History", *Proceedings of the Twelfth World Congress of Jewish Studies Jerusalem, July 29 – August 5, 1997*. Division A. The Bible and Its World (ed. R. MARGOLIN) (Jerusalem 1999) 35-43. Lemche's response to these types of criticism is to minimize the significance of any objective, empirical extra-biblical evidence by allowing that only a smidgen of veracity may be found in the historical narratives. For example, commenting on extra-biblical inscriptions mentioning Israelite and Judahite kings in connection with international events referred to also in the Bible, he writes that they show only that biblical evidence on the succession of kings and synchronisms 'are not totally misleading', and that after biblical and extra-biblical data are compared one may conclude that the

‘ancient Israel’, as defined by minimalists, owes its discovery to the research of scholars, but not that these modern scholars have composed a theological fiction.

Recently, Lemche felt constrained to defend minimalism and (specific) minimalist scholars against two sets of charges: the first, that its general claims and specific interpretations of data are driven by ideological — Marxist, anti-Christian establishment, anti-Israel, pro-Palestinian, anti-Semitic — positions; the second, that many of its strongest claims involving ancient Near Eastern languages and cultures, sociological and archaeological data are advanced by underqualified individuals. Lemche, allowing that some minimalist scholars do have their own private programs, argued that the term ‘ideological’ in the published accusations is vague, but that no matter how the term is used, there is nothing ‘ideological’ about concluding that the Persian period is the single period that best explains the ‘mental matrix’ for most Old Testament literature and ‘probably all of its historiography’⁽²⁸⁾. I consider this a valid rebuttal⁽²⁹⁾.

Regarding qualifications. Although he presented his own

history of the biblical historians ‘is not totally devoid of historical information’. Surprisingly and strangely, Lemche writes about the period most crucial to most minimalists, but, apparently, no longer to him, ‘the Persian period is, finally, a dark spot on the historical map of Palestine. We know nothing about this period. Ezra, the great hero of post-exilic Judaism is probably a late invention (by Pharisaic authors?)’; cf. LEMCHE, “On the Problems of Reconstructing Pre-Hellenistic Israelite (Palestinian) History”, 5.5; 8.9.

⁽²⁸⁾ N.P. LEMCHE, “Ideology and the History of Ancient Israel”, *SJOT* 14 (2000) 169-173, 190-193. The contradiction between his assessment of the Persian period in this statement and that cited in the previous footnote, both published the same year, has not yet been clarified in subsequent publications.

⁽²⁹⁾ For this reason the controversial book by K.W. WHITELAM, *The Invention of Ancient Israel. The Silencing of Palestinian History* (London 1996) has had no significant ongoing role in minimalist discussions. It is beside the point. A minimalist, Whitlam adopts the anti-Orientalist stance of the literary critic E. Said in critiquing both maximalists and minimalists. All are faulted for being Anglo-European scholars and for writing in the etic terminology of western scholarship (*ibid.*, 393-370, 119-121, 203-222, 234, 236). The book, a cleverly written rhetorical polemic, is all negative criticism. It presents neither a positive agenda nor any ‘how to’ formulae of its own nor does it even suggest how unsuppressed history might look. Astonishingly, Whitlam reveals only in the last sentences on the last page of his book that throughout he only assumed the existence of the history that he claimed was suppressed. It has not yet been ‘(re)discovered’ (*ibid.*, 237). There is no historical revisionism here, only a preference for silence.

credentials as one long acquainted and working with anthropological data, he did not defend minimalism against the second group of charges.

Insofar as minimalists advance their position primarily on the basis of inferences about data from Biblical texts filtered through analytical tools developed for the literary study of the ‘fiction’ genre, and only secondarily on the basis of a perceived *absence* of contradictory data from archaeology, the Minimalist-Maximalist debate is between Biblicists⁽³⁰⁾. No Syro-Palestinian archaeologist espouses a historical position *vis-à-vis* the origins of Biblical literature faintly resembling that of the minimalists — a position which, in any event, would have nothing to do with archaeology *per se* — and none have supported their particular interpretations for the absence of archaeological data.

III. The ‘Tenth Century’ Debate

The ‘Tenth Century’ debate was precipitated by Israel Finkelstein. Since the early 1990s he has charged that archaeological data interpreted as indicating the presence of a strong centralized kingdom in Israel and Judah during the tenth century BCE have been dated incorrectly. Materially, the debate focuses on whether or not excavations at a number of major Iron Age sites such as Beersheba, Dan, Hazor, Jerusalem, and Megiddo allow concluding that (1) there was no monumental architecture, i.e., water works, city walls, palaces or temples, during the tenth century; and (2) that the earliest evidence for these types of construction projects dates from the middle of the ninth century.

In Syro-Palestinian archaeology, dates are regularly established through the use of pottery found in an excavation checked against a ceramic chronology. The basis of this chronology lies in the discovery made at the end of the nineteenth and the beginning of the twentieth century that the types of pottery, shapes, styles, manner of manufacture

⁽³⁰⁾ For example, minimalists assume the large non-indigenous population in Yehud whose anxious comprehension of its own circumstances precipitated the creative process generating what became Biblical literature. In fact, although information from both Biblical and extra-Biblical written sources attest the settlement of foreign populations around Samaria in the eighth-seventh centuries BCE by the Assyrians, no such evidence supports a similar scenario for the areas around Jerusalem after the Babylonians exiled parts of the local population in the sixth-fifth centuries BCE. No evidence, however, contradicts the assumption.

and design favored by people changed slowly but perceptibly over time within all regions of the ancient Near East. It is akin to dating an old photograph by the clothing, hairstyle, furniture, radios, and even the types of poses assumed by the people in it. On the basis of these clues, the photograph might be dated to 1915 in Rome but to 1950 in Romania. Both content and context determine the correct interpretation.

Writing in 1891 about what is now considered the first scientific excavation in the Holy Land, Petrie stated: 'The excavations at Tell el-Hesi (*sic!*) proved to be an ideal place for determining the history of pottery in Palestine. And once settle the pottery of a country, and the key is in our hands for all future explorations' ⁽³¹⁾. Since Petrie published his gross categorizations and sequencing of pottery types and shapes chronologically, the relative ceramic chronology of the Land of Israel has been worked out with painstaking care. In the absence of more definite evidence, this chronology is used to determine the general dates of adjacent structures.

Some efforts to achieve (almost) absolute dating have been made by determining connections between the Palestinian ceramic repertoire and the chronologies of Syria and Egypt where pottery is sometimes found with datable written or inscribed finds, as well as by focusing on certain local assemblages — aggregates of different types of vessels from a single locus or stratum — that can be dated absolutely either by written materials or by definite association with a historical event. For example, at a site such as Lachish known to have been captured and destroyed by the Assyrians in 701 BCE on the basis of Assyrian records and palace reliefs, assemblages excavated on floors immediately beneath obvious destruction debris are assigned confidently to 701 BCE. The use of each particular type of vessel in the assemblage may, however, have started much earlier and continued much later ⁽³²⁾. Each has its own history, like the clothing, hairstyles, and radios in the photograph mentioned above.

Archaeologists have drafted carbon-14 technology to aid their attempt in delimiting the chronological horizons of individual assemblages and of the individual types within them. Used to date organic substances recovered in digs, it was hoped that by coordinating ceramics with recovered organic finds, the parameters of ceramic

⁽³¹⁾ F. PETRIE, *Tell el-Hesi (Lachish)* (London 1891) 40.

⁽³²⁾ I thank Profs. A. Mazar of the Hebrew University and S. Gitin, Director of the W.F. Albright Institute for Archaeological Research in Jerusalem, for discussing this problem with me briefly in January, 2001.

chronology could be tightened. Results, however, have been disappointingly inconclusive⁽³³⁾.

Two levels of confidence are invested in ceramic chronology today: medium range and high range. Medium range confidence is reflected by those arguing that this body of refined knowledge is such that in Syro-Palestinian archaeology any given assemblage can be dated to within about 40 years, plus or minus 40. High range confidence, such as that expressed by Finkelstein, is reflected by those arguing that an assemblage may be dated to within 25 years, plus or minus 25. In addition, however, Finkelstein, challenges the general soundness of the conventional chronology from twelfth through the end of the ninth centuries BCE, lowering the dates of some types of pottery and whole assemblages by more than 100 years⁽³⁴⁾.

Since monumental projects are attested in the archaeological record at major Iron Age sites, Finkelstein's case rests on his ability a) to create a new ceramic chronology for what heretofore have been considered typical Iron Age I and IIA types of pottery in associated assemblages, not only in Israel but also at other sites in the Levant;

⁽³³⁾ Problems using dates provided by carbon-14 analyses are apparent in the fact that different laboratories in Europe, Israel, and the United States working with similar samples provide different B(efore) P(resent) dates as do the same laboratories with the same samples. Among the sources for the discrepancies are the types of samples provided, their quality of preservation, and the problem of contamination before and after being submitted to the laboratory for analysis. Despite this, carbon-14 dating of grain and wood samples from well defined Iron Age strata at sites such as Bethsaida by the Sea of Galilee, Dor by the Mediterranean coast, and Tel Rehov south of Bethshean and, of course, Megiddo have now become part of the debate because the range of dates obtained have been interpreted as providing relevant limits. Dates provided by samples from Dor reportedly support some of Finkelstein's low chronology dates while those from Bethsaida contradict them completely. Complicating this picture is the fact that archaeologists do not always publish the dates of all samples reported back to them by the laboratories, only those which appear useful. This matter is now being engaged by an important project, conducted by Drs. I. Sharon and A. Gilboa at the Hebrew University Institute of Archaeology. Their project coordinates all carbon-14 data in the hope that patterns in the discrepancies can be discerned that will help work out the bugs so that this and other high-tech approaches will be able to provide absolute dates independent of pottery chronology. Its success will depend on archaeologists providing them with *all* information about *all* tested samples.

⁽³⁴⁾ I. FINKELSTEIN, "The Date of the Settlement of the Philistines in Canaan", *TA* 22 (1995) 218-225, 229-233; S. BUNIMOVITZ – A. FAUST, "Chronological Separation, Geographical Segregation, or Ethnic Demarcation? Ethnography and the Iron Age Low Chronology", *BASOR* 322 (2001) 1-3.

and b) to bring order to sites where the consensus acknowledges that the stratigraphic sequencing for the tenth century is unclear, *but without creating disorder at sites where it is clear.*

He propounds a complex argument based on hand burnished red slip ware, i.e., a type dipped in a red clay wash and then buffed by hand with a piece of ceramic to give at least parts of it a shiny patina. At Jezreel, it was found only in the ninth century stratum and not in spotty, earlier tenth century material recovered at the site. Combining Jezreel data with those from his excavations at Megiddo, he concludes that this pottery is to be dated exclusively to the ninth century. Since, according to his dating, the pottery is associated with monumental architecture, he extrapolates that all such construction should be assigned to the ninth century, at the earliest. Consequently, attested construction projects assigned to David, Solomon, Rehoboam and Jeroboam in the tenth century on the basis of the established chronology and on the strength of Biblical accounts of their building activities, projects that infer the presence of significant economic resources, a labor pool supportable by an economy greater than subsistence level, and an organized, central administration, are dated incorrectly. The projects could only have been undertaken by kings living no less than 50 years after the death of Solomon.

At a theoretical level, at issue is whether or not Finkelstein has isolated a *significant factual discrepancy in ceramic chronology* of such moment that it requires the changes for which he calls.

The archaeological community as a whole rejects Finkelstein's ceramic chronology on well argued archaeological grounds⁽³⁵⁾. The consensus maintains that published, and reported but still unpublished, archaeological evidence supports both a tenth and ninth century dates for the tell-tale pottery as well as for the construction of monumental projects at the above-mentioned sites⁽³⁶⁾. In the few places where

⁽³⁵⁾ E.g. A. MAZAR – J. CAMP, "Will Tel Rehov Save the United Monarchy?", *BAR* 26/2 (2000) 48-50. FINKELSTEIN's presentation of his case appears in the following essential studies: "The Archaeology of the United Monarchy: An Alternative View", *Levant* 28 (1996) 177-187; "The Stratigraphy and Chronology of Megiddo and Beth-Shan in the 12th-11th Centuries B.C.E.", *TA* 23 (1996) 170-184; "Bible Archaeology or Archaeology of Palestine in the Iron Age? A Rejoinder", *Levant* 30 (1998) 167-173; "Hazor and the North in the Iron Age: A Low Chronology Perspective", *BASOR* 314 (1999) 55-70; "Hazor XII-XI with an Addendum on Ben-Tor's Dating of Hazor X-VII", *TA* 27 (2000) 231-247.

⁽³⁶⁾ Aside from qualified acceptance of some of his positions by two colleagues at Tel-Aviv University, D. Ussishkin and Z. Herzog, I am unaware of

evidence for such projects is unaccountably missing, the absence may be attributed in part to erosion, ancient robbing, and, in the case of Jerusalem, to Roman engineers who preferred building on stable, hard, flat, surfaces. They shaved large areas almost to bedrock, removing the debris of earlier construction, in order to create uncluttered platforms for their own structures⁽³⁷⁾. It has been suggested orally at a few archaeological meetings that since no clear tenth century BCE stratum was found at Jezreel, the absence of the burnished red slip ware in what was found sealed under the ninth century stratum may be due to Ahab who ordered a similar clearing of the site prior to constructing a palace and administrative center⁽³⁸⁾. In any event, the absence of evidence may not be interpreted facilely as evidence of absence⁽³⁹⁾.

Syro-Palestinian archaeologists, including those with no vested interest in Iron Age archaeology, who accept his overall thesis. Most rebuttals have been in scholarly presentations in Israel and the U.S.A., and many were repeated in public lectures. Fewer have been made in print, and these are by archaeologists whose sites Finkelstein re-evaluated in print in order to bolster his case: A. MAZAR, "Iron Age Chronology: A Reply to I. Finkelstein", *Levant* 29 (1997) 157-167; A. BEN-TOR – D. BEN-AMI, "Hazor and the Archaeology of the Tenth Century B.C.E.", *IEJ* 48 (1998) 1-37; A. BEN-TOR, "Hazor and the Chronology of Northern Israel: A Reply to Israel Finkelstein", *BASOR* 317 (2000) 9-15; MAZAR – CAMP, "Will Tel Rehov", 48-50. On Jan 10, 2001, a one day conference "The Question of the Tenth and Ninth Centuries BCE at Sites in the Land of Israel", jointly sponsored by the Israel Antiquities Authority and the Center for the Study of the Land of Israel and Its Settlement, was held in Jerusalem. All reports presented there, from peripheral sites in the north, Horbat Rosh Zayit (identified as biblical Cabul), Rehob, Bethshean to southern sites such as Tel Hamid, Tel Batash (identified as biblical Timnah), Tel Safit (identified with biblical Gath), Lachish, and even from excavations in Jerusalem provided clear stratigraphical evidence for tenth century BCE strata and pottery assemblages.

⁽³⁷⁾ In Jerusalem, the only area where intensive, large-scale excavations that might bear on this problem is in the City of David. There, however, the excavations were restricted to non-damaged parts of the steep eastern slope and no monumental structures datable to this period identified.

⁽³⁸⁾ An apologetic but low rhetoric rebuttal to this analysis is found in D. USSISHKIN, "The Credibility of the Tel Jezreel Excavations: A Rejoinder to Amnon Ben-Tor", *TA* 27 (2000) 248-256.

⁽³⁹⁾ Another element in argumentation supporting what is called the 'low chronology' was Finkelstein's observation that tall collared-rim jars, characteristic of the twelfth-eleventh centuries are completely absent from stratum VI A at Megiddo, a stratum excavated both by the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago and by the Tel-Aviv University Institute of Archaeology. In an intensive reinvestigation of records, photographs, and materials from the

Since the archaeological record, as interpreted by Finkelstein, indicates that no major building projects were undertaken during the tenth century, his conclusions bolster minimalist claims about the fictional nature of Biblical narratives about David, Solomon, Rehoboam and Jeroboam. Because of this connection, the ‘tenth century’ debate has been confused with the ‘minimalist-maximalist’ one and has led to Finkelstein being labeled a ‘minimalist’ incorrectly. Despite their adoption of his conclusion to further their argument, Finkelstein is not a participant in the minimalist-maximalist debate. That debate, however, has influenced some marginal elements in the archeological discourse, confusing matters a bit more. Finkelstein cites minimalist conclusions favorably as a secondary or tertiary explanation for the ‘missing’ tenth century, but does not participate in their Biblical discussion *per se*⁽⁴⁰⁾.

Much historical information in Kings about events after the ninth century has been corroborated by extra-biblical sources, primarily from Mesopotamia. This information is necessary for Finkelstein in interpreting his own data from Megiddo, so he does not jettison it. Ultimately, as minimalists seem not to have understood, all archaeological data from historical periods are interpreted through texts.

He argues, in a recent book co-authored with the archaeological journalist Silberman, that the combination of local traditions into a narrative glorifying Judah and the first tendentious history writing by the Deuteronomistic writer began in the sixth century BCE under the influence of Josiah’s court. The ancient Judahite historian had access to some authentic information of a historical nature from his own kingdom as well as from the northern kingdom, Israel, that had been destroyed by the Assyrians more than a century earlier⁽⁴¹⁾. This clear articulation puts him somewhere in the maximalist camp.

Chicago Oriental Institute’s excavations of the early twentieth century, Timothy P. Harrison of the University of Toronto uncovered evidence for the presence of such jars (in what is now called stratum VI A). Furthermore, Finkelstein informed me that in Summer 2000, his team discovered a restorable, whole collared-rim jar in the same stratum. Harrison’s work and the corroborating new discovery present data inconvenient for the proposed chronology.

⁽⁴⁰⁾ FINKELSTEIN, “The Archaeology of the United Monarchy”, 177.

⁽⁴¹⁾ I. FINKELSTEIN – N.A. SILBERMAN, *The Bible Unearthed*. Archaeology’s New Vision of Ancient Israel and the Origins of its Sacred Texts (New York 2001) 45, 65, 68, 92-96, 284, 301-305. The book presents Finkelstein’s positions — the ‘New Vision’ of the title — on a number of key and minor issues in

Finkelstein has succumbed, however, to the appeal of a minimalist rhetorical ploy, that of describing an opponent as taking the position of 'the custodian of the ideal, harmonic picture of Bible archaeology, which argues for a glorious Solomonic state, against an intruder who threatens to shatter the sentimental images' ⁽⁴²⁾. This sentence alludes to the Rabbinic midrash of a young Abraham who, after discerning the truth of monotheism through reasoned analysis, destroyed the idols in the workshop of his idolater father, Terah. The term 'Bible archaeology' in the above citation is intended to evoke the dispute of two decades ago from a completely secular perspective.

Notwithstanding this crossover of rhetoric, the 'minimalist-maximalist' debate is unlike the 'tenth century' one with regard to the training of the disputants, the nature of the evidence, the quality of the evidence, and the type of the rhetoric. The former involves Biblicists, linguists, and epigraphers; the latter archaeologists. Furthermore, in this debate, the issue of competency has not been raised, only that of conclusions.

If anti-religious sentiment lies in the background of the minimalists, and pro-religious sentiment or nostalgia in that of the different maximalists, something else informs the tenth century debate. None of the protagonists identify themselves as religious.

For the last fifteen years or so, there has existed in Israel a penchant among young historians for radical revisionism of Israeli and Jewish history in general and Israeli socio-political history in particular. Revisionism of pre- and post-1948 history, which is regularly reported and discussed in the press and on television talk and

Israelite history, not only the tenth century debate, but it does so without comment as to their status in the field (*ibid.*, 114-118, 141, 142). In doing so, it misleads its intended audience which will include Biblicists unfamiliar with details of the archaeological debate. The book presents hypotheses as facts, not informing readers what is disputed and why, and it does not indicate that there are difficulties or uncertainties about the new vision, not of 'archaeology', but of a single archaeologist.

⁽⁴²⁾ FINKELSTEIN, "Bible Archaeology or Archaeology of Palestine", 167. Similarly, commenting on why the late Y. Yadin and Y. Aharoni dated Iron Age I at Hazor to the twelfth-eleventh centuries BCE, he writes: '... it is obvious that their dating was influenced by their historio-biblical bias more than by a thorough typological investigation. Yadin was eager to see his early Israelites settle on the ruins of the city which they had vanquished' (*id.*, "Hazor XII-XI with an Addendum on Ben-Tor's Dating of Hazor X-VII", *TA* 27 [2000] 237). The Hazor excavations were concluded in 1958. Yadin and Aharoni, both deceased, are faulted for not having reached conclusions similar to those of Finkelstein.

disagree. It demonstrates also, beyond cavil, that archaeological data, understood as attesting to dynamic events, contribute to historical understanding even as historical texts contribute to their interpretation.

These by-products of the three debates indicate that the malaise surrounding research into the history of ancient Israel is unwarranted. If the last two debates have not demonstrated to most Biblicists and historians what is correct, they have suggested which ideas have been tested and found wanting; in doing so, they have generated opportunities for experimentation with new ideas and with new methods.

University of Judaism
15600 Mulholland Drive
Los Angeles, CA 90077 (USA)

Ziony ZEVIT

SUMMARY

Three significant debates affecting perceptions of Israelite history, the Bible's historiography, the relationship between this historiography and archaeology, and the dating of parts of the Bible's literature have occupied Biblicists and archaeologists for the last 25 years. This article distinguishes the debates by analyzing the issues involved, the terminologies employed, as well as the professions of the protagonists engaged in each. It considers each within its own intellectual context. In light of these analyses, the article proposes a positive assessment of the contribution of these debates to the study ancient Israel's history.

Le temps dans l'histoire de Joseph (Gn 37–50)

Repères temporels pour une analyse narrative

L'histoire de Joseph (ci-après, HJ) développe une intrigue particulièrement sophistiquée. En revanche, elle semble un peu moins élaborée au plan de la temporalité. En effet, le narrateur semble y respecter les conventions du récit biblique. Néanmoins, l'ampleur de ce récit en fait un beau terrain d'observation de la manière de gérer le temps dans une narration. Car celle-ci implique à la fois une continuité où s'articulent constamment présent et passé et futur, et un rythme qui mette en évidence le relief du récit.

Pour explorer la temporalité de l'HJ, (i) j'examinerai d'abord le cadre chronologique du récit, avec sa structure de base et quelques particularités, dont le jeu complexe entre temps racontant et temps raconté. Après quoi, seront envisagés les écarts que le narrateur se permet dans sa gestion du temps: (ii) les prolepses et annonces de tous ordres, puis (iii) les analepses et autres reprises de moments passés.

I. La structure temporelle de l'HJ

1. Cadre chronologique global

La narration de l'HJ en Gn 37–50 suit *grosso modo* la chronologie de l'histoire racontée⁽¹⁾. Celle-ci est balisée par des notations chronologiques précises qui fournissent un cadre temporel global aux faits relatés. En voici un tableau où on lit en italique les âges donnés par le narrateur, et, à droite, l'âge de Joseph lors des faits situés dans le temps:

⁽¹⁾ Cette manière de faire est habituelle dans les récits bibliques: voir ce qu'en disent S. BAR-EFRAT, *Narrative Art in the Bible* (JSOTSS 70; Sheffield 1989) 166, et M. STERNBERG, «Time and Space in Biblical (Hi)story Telling: The Grand Chronology», *The Book and the Text. The Bible and Literary Theory* (ed. R.M. SCHWARTZ) (Oxford 1990) 82. De même: J.P. FOKKELMAN, *Reading Biblical Narrative. A Practical Guide* (Leiden 1999) 171: «The story offers a series of events, actions and speeches that obey the chronological order. Incidental interruptions of this succession-determined stream by a flashback or an anticipation are no more than exceptions proving the rule».

37,2	«Joseph avait <i>dix-sept</i> ans...»	17
41,1	Au bout de deux ans, Pharaon rêvait...	[28]
41,46	«Joseph avait <i>trente</i> ans quand il se tint en présence Pharaon...»	30
41,47	«Et la terre produisit pendant les sept années de la satiété»	
41,50	«À Joseph naquirent deux fils avant que vienne l'année de la famine»	
41,53	«Et s'achevèrent les sept années de la satiété...» ⁽²⁾	[37]
41,54	«et commencèrent à venir les sept années de la famine...»	
42,3	«et dix frères de Joseph descendirent pour acheter en Égypte» ⁽³⁾	
45,6	[La 2 ^e rencontre des frères a lieu la 2 ^e année de famine — Joseph a 38 ans:]	[38]
45,11	«car voici deux ans que la famine est au sein du pays,	
47,9	et encore cinq ans qu'il n'y aura ni labour ni moisson» «encore cinq ans de famine» [Jacob et ses fils émigrent en Égypte] «Jacob dit à Pharaon: "Les jours des années de mes migrations: <i>cent trente</i> ans"»	
47,28	«Et Jacob vécut <i>dix-sept</i> ans en terre d'Égypte... [Joseph a 38+17 = 55 ans]	[55]
47,29	et les jours de Jacob des années de sa vie furent <i>cent quarante-sept</i> ans. Quand les jours de la mort d'Israël s'approchèrent...»	
50,22b	«Et Joseph vécut <i>cent dix</i> ans»	110
50,26	«Et Joseph mourut à <i>cent dix</i> ans» [donc 55 ans après Jacob ⁽⁴⁾]	110

À la vue de ce tableau, on voit que cinq moments du récit sont clairement situés dans le temps: le moment où se noue la crise familiale quand Joseph a 17 ans (chap. 37), son élévation par le Pharaon à l'âge de 30 ans (chap. 41), les trois descentes en Égypte racontées dans un récit continu, bien balisé temporellement (chap. 42–47) ⁽⁵⁾, les derniers jours de Jacob, en particulier ses dernières paroles (47,28) et la mort de Joseph (50,22.26). Il s'agit là des grands blocs narratifs de l'histoire telle qu'elle est racontée, les «actes» du drame. L'acte I raconte la vente de Joseph; l'acte II montre comment

⁽²⁾ C'est l'âge d'Isaac à la mort de sa mère Sara (cf. Gn 17,17; 21,5 et 23,1).

⁽³⁾ Les retrouvailles ont donc lieu après 20 ans de séparation, comme celles de Jacob et Ésaü en Canaan (cf. Gn 31,38).

⁽⁴⁾ On notera d'emblée que Joseph vit la moitié de sa vie du vivant de son père. Il vit d'abord dix-sept ans avec lui en Canaan, et Jacob vivra dix-sept autres années avec lui en Égypte. Ils sont donc séparés durant 21 ans.

⁽⁵⁾ Voir les marqueurs temporels scandant les étapes du récit en 42,17-18 (3 jours), 27 (à l'étape), 29 (chez leur père); 43,2 (quand ils eurent achevé de manger le grain), 15b (en Égypte chez Joseph), 16 et 25 (à midi); 44,3 (le matin), 14 (Joseph encore chez lui); 45,1 (quand Joseph se fait connaître à ses frères), 25 (en Canaan chez Jacob); 46,7 (arrivée en Égypte); 47,11 (installation).

celui-ci atteint la gloire; l'acte III relate les retrouvailles progressives de la famille, et l'acte IV tourne autour de la mort de Jacob. Enfin, un bref épilogue évoque en quelques lignes la seconde moitié de la vie de Joseph (50,22-26).

Reste apparemment en dehors de ce cadre le contenu des chapitres 38 à 40. Le narrateur présente comme contemporains les débuts de ces deux épisodes puisque, d'une part, il relie formellement le départ de Juda loin de ses frères à l'époque de la vente de Joseph (38,1: וידי בעת הרוֹא⁽⁶⁾), tandis que, d'autre part, les aventures de Joseph en Égypte commencent lorsqu'il arrive chez Putiphar (39,1), arrivée déjà mentionnée à la fin du chapitre 37 (v. 36). Mais à part ce point de contact, chaque épisode suit sa chronologie propre qui se caractérise par un certain flou. Dans l'histoire de Juda, les faits s'étalent entre le départ de Juda et les neuf mois qui suivent le deuil que le héros fait pour son épouse dont les deux aînés sont déjà morts à l'âge adulte (38,12.24.28). Quant à l'épisode de la femme de Putiphar (39,7-20), il est situé par rapport à ce qui précède par une formule usuelle servant à signaler une ellipse ou un blanc dont la durée n'est pas déterminée: וידי אחר הדברים האלה (39,7)⁽⁷⁾. L'incertitude quant à la situation chronologique exacte de ce qui arrive à Joseph durera jusqu'en 41,46. En 41,1, le narrateur précisera bien que Joseph reste deux ans de plus en prison, mais ce repère ne rejoint cependant pas encore la chronologie générale du récit.

⁽⁶⁾ Voir Th.L. HETTEMA, *Reading for Good. Narrative Theology and Ethics in the Joseph Story from the Perspective of Ricoeur's Hermeneutics* (Studies in philosophical theology 18; Kampen 1996) 220. Voir la position du problème par STERNBERG, «Time and Space», 123-125, qui suggère notamment que la contemporanéité apparente sert à rapprocher deux scènes où un père est trompé.

⁽⁷⁾ Cette formule est employée trois fois dans l'HJ. Ici, et en 40,1, elle intervient après un sommaire (39,1-6; 39,20b-23) qui résume certaines circonstances formant l'arrière-plan de la scène qui suit: le succès de Joseph dans la maison du maître ainsi que sa grande beauté suggèrent le motif de l'attitude de la femme de Putiphar; de même, la faveur et le statut que Joseph acquiert auprès du chef de la prison expliquent pourquoi il lui confie la garde des deux prisonniers importants. En 48,1, la formule fait suite à une brève scène (47,29-31) où Jacob fait jurer à Joseph de l'enterrer dans le tombeau de ses pères. Joseph accepte, ce qui explique peut-être que, dans la scène suivante, Jacob fait à Joseph la faveur d'adopter ses deux fils et de les bénir (48,1-20). L'expression en question ne jouerait donc pas seulement le rôle de marqueur temporel; elle assurerait aussi un lien logique avec la scène qui suit. Sur l'ellipse temporelle ou le blanc narratif, voir J.L. SKA, «De quelques ellipses dans les récits bibliques», *Bib* 76 (1995) 63-71, surtout p. 64-65, et la bibliographie en notes.

Ainsi, les chapitres 38 à 41 sont comme soustraits à la chronologie de l'HJ, et cela, même si on sait que la double action commence peu après les faits narrés dans la seconde moitié du chapitre 37. Le contact avec la chronologie globale ne se rétablit qu'après l'élévation de Joseph par Pharaon. Ceci permet sans doute de préciser l'extension de l'acte II: il comprend l'ensemble de ces chapitres qui, sans que leur chronologie soit clarifiée, relatent deux histoires parallèles dont les héros sont deux des fils de Jacob qui ont joué un rôle majeur dans l'acte I: Joseph, le frère vendu, et Juda qui a eu l'idée de le vendre⁽⁸⁾. La crise familiale qui envahit les actes I et III est du reste quasi absente de l'acte II (cf. 40,15; 41,51-52).

2. Des incohérences chronologiques en 38,1-30 et 46,8-27

Dans cette chronologie, le narrateur tolère d'importantes distorsions qu'il se garde toutefois de signaler explicitement à l'attention du lecteur, à savoir le chapitre 38 et la liste généalogique de 46,8-27. Avec raison, l'exégèse classique a tiré argument de ces anomalies pour conclure à des ajouts secondaires.

La chronologie interne du chapitre 38 suppose un temps sans doute plus long que les vingt ans qui s'écoulent entre le départ de Joseph et le premier voyage des frères en Égypte⁽⁹⁾. Juda quitte la famille, épouse la fille de Shua qui lui donne trois fils. Il marie son aîné Er, puis l'enterre, un peu avant son frère Onân. L'action principale se situe alors que son troisième fils, Shéla, est arrivé à un âge nubile (v. 14b). Pourtant, toute cette affaire semble terminée lorsque Jacob envoie ses fils acheter du blé en Égypte pour eux et leurs familles. En effet, d'après 46,12, dans la liste de ceux qui émigrent en Égypte, on exclut Er et Onan déjà décédés, mais Zèrakh et Pèrez font bien partie de la caravane. Le second des jumeaux de Tamar est même déjà père de deux fils, une indication qui semble montrer que le début du chapitre 38 est à situer avant les faits racontés au chapitre 37! Ce n'est pas la seule incongruité de la liste des descendants de Jacob. Une autre curiosité frappe le lecteur attentif: Benjamin, le «petit frère» de Joseph, a déjà dix fils — ce qui fait de lui

⁽⁸⁾ Cette proposition de structure globale s'appuie aussi sur l'observation des changements de lieux et de personnages, mais ce n'est pas ici le lieu de le montrer.

⁽⁹⁾ Voir HETTEMA, *Reading for Good*, 219-220. J.L. SKA, "Our Fathers Have Told Us". Introduction to the Analysis of Hebrew Narratives (SubBib 13; Roma 1990) 11, parle, à propos de Gn 37–39, de l'alternance entre deux fils narratifs contemporains. Voir déjà L. ALONSO SCHÖKEL, *Dov'è tuo fratello?* Pagine di fraternità nel libro della Genesi (Brescia 1987) 289.

le plus prolifique des fils de Jacob (46,21). Or, à supposer même qu'il ait trente ans, il ne doit guère en avoir plus...

Ces deux sections interrompant le récit et dont la chronologie implicite est peu cohérente avec le fil de l'HJ peuvent être qualifiées de «digressions». Au demeurant, l'interruption est chaque fois indiquée par une «reprise»: 39,1 fait écho à la fin du chapitre 37 pour signaler que l'on renoue avec le fil narratif principal, tandis que 46,27b clôture la liste en reprenant les derniers mots du récit qui précède celle-ci (v. 7b: verbe בּוֹא + מַצְרִימָה)⁽¹⁰⁾, des mots qui fonctionnaient déjà comme «crochet» au début de la liste (v. 8a).

Mais si le narrateur se permet ces entorses chronologiques, c'est que le fait d'insérer ces digressions est narrativement plus significatif qu'une parfaite cohérence temporelle. Ce n'est pas le lieu ici de traiter cette question en long et en large. Je me contente donc de l'une ou l'autre remarque au niveau de la gestion du temps. Sous cet angle de vue, il est clair que l'insertion de l'histoire de Juda⁽¹¹⁾ induit chez le lecteur qui aborde la suite la nette impression qu'un long temps a passé depuis que Joseph a disparu avec les marchands. Cela accentue encore le sentiment de l'éloignement considérable de Joseph vis-à-vis des siens et en particulier de son père en deuil (37,34b). Par ailleurs, au long de ces années, Joseph a eu le temps de mûrir dans une épreuve prolongée; aussi, le lecteur s'étonnera moins de voir que l'adolescent inconsidéré (37,4-11) est devenu un homme décidé qui s'oppose résolument à la femme de son maître (39,9). Quant à la longue liste des descendants que Jacob emmène avec lui en Égypte, elle relève sans doute du procédé de «retard» qui ménage une tension narrative là où, sans cela, il n'y en aurait guère. Entre le désir de Jacob de revoir Joseph au plus vite et son

⁽¹⁰⁾ Sur la digression et la reprise, voir SKA, «*Our Fathers*», 9.

⁽¹¹⁾ Pour ce chapitre, c'est sans doute à partir des points communs entre l'épisode et ceux qui l'entourent (chap. 37 et 39) que l'on peut éclairer la question de sa fonction essentielle à cet endroit. Sur ces contacts, voir R. ALTER, *The Art of Biblical Narrative* (London 1981) 3-12 et J.P. FOKKELMAN, «Genesis 37 and 38 at the Interface of Structural Analysis and Hermeneutics», *Literary Structure and Rhetorical Strategies in the Bible* (ed. L.J. DE REGT – J. WAARD – J.P. FOKKELMAN) (Assen 1996) 152-187, pour le rapport entre Gn 37 et 38; pour les relations entre 38 et 39, voir J.-L. SKA – J.-P. SONNET – A. WÉNIN, *L'analyse narrative des récits de l'Ancien Testament* (CEv 107; Paris 1999) 55-56. Mais il ne faut pas négliger une possibilité laissée ouverte par le narrateur: le chap. 38 pourrait fournir des clés de compréhension du changement survenu chez Juda entre le début de l'histoire et les chap. 43-44; à ce sujet, voir STERNBERG, «Time and Space», 130-134, ou HETTEMA, *Reading for Good*, 182-183.

départ immédiat, d'une part (45,28–46,1), et les retrouvailles effectives, d'autre part (46,29), le narrateur insère plusieurs éléments qui reculent pour le lecteur le moment attendu et lui font sentir l'impatience qui doit être celle de Jacob: la halte à Beér-Shèva et l'oracle qui pourrait mettre en question le désir du vieillard (46,1-4, cf. 26,2), la description de la caravane avec l'inventaire de tout ce que Jacob emporte (vv. 5-7), le décompte détaillé et précis des personnes qui l'accompagnent (vv. 8-27), et enfin l'envoi de Juda en éclaireur (v. 28)⁽¹²⁾.

3. Les sommaires concernant la famine en 41,53-57 et 47,13-26

Un autre élément est à relever concernant la structure temporelle de l'HJ. Le long acte III, où ont lieu la construction de la fraternité et les retrouvailles familiales (42,1–47,12), est encadré par de brefs passages faisant état de l'activité de Joseph durant la famine: un sommaire (41,53-57) et un récit (47,13-26). Ce qui est ainsi raconté constitue le cadre général des trois descentes des frères, et est donc au moins en partie contemporain des événements familiaux. Ainsi, il est assez clair que le sommaire de la fin du chapitre 41 où est évoqué le début des années de disette décrit les circonstances de la demande de Jacob à ses fils en 42,1-2. Il trouve un prolongement lorsque le narrateur montre comment Joseph gère la crise tout en préparant pour l'Égypte une politique agraire collectiviste qu'il applique dès la fin des années de famine lorsque de nouvelles semences sont possibles et qu'une récolte peut être espérée (47,23-24).

Il reste que le début du récit de 47,13-26 reprend la fin du sommaire du chapitre 41: la famine est lourde, et l'Égypte dépérit comme Canaan, au point qu'en vendant le grain, Joseph récolte peu à peu tout l'argent disponible (47,13-14, voir 41,55-57). Ce qui est raconté là semble donc être contemporain des visites des frères. Une telle superposition pourrait être significative car elle permet de rapprocher la façon dont Joseph traite sa famille et ce qu'il fait envers les gens du pays⁽¹³⁾: alors qu'il amasse pour Pharaon l'argent des

⁽¹²⁾ Ici aussi, d'autres éléments explicatifs devraient être explorés, p. ex. l'aspect récapitulatif des allusions à ce qui précède en Gn, disséminées dans cette liste de personnes.

⁽¹³⁾ C'est ce que SKA, "Our Fathers", 10, appelle la technique du tuilage. Sur la difficulté de situer les faits rapportés en 47,13-26 (en particulier la deuxième année du v. 18) par rapport à ceux de l'intrigue principale, avec une superposition temporelle possible, voir Y.W. FUNG, *Victim and Victimizer. Joseph's Interpretation of his Destiny* (JSOTSS 308; Sheffield 2000) 43.

populations affamées (47,14-15a), il rend à ses frères leur argent (42,25; 44,1; cf. 45,22); tandis qu'il achète le bétail des Égyptiens contre du pain (47,16-17), il installe sa famille et son bétail dans de gras pâturages tout en les nourrissant (45,10-11; 46,32-34; 47,6.12); et alors qu'à l'instigation d'Égyptiens minés par la faim, il acquiert leurs biens fonciers pour Pharaon (47,18-21), c'est avec l'assentiment de celui-ci qu'il donne aux siens une propriété dans le meilleur du pays (47,11-12) — sa famille en venant ainsi à jouir du privilège des prêtres, les seuls Égyptiens à pouvoir conserver leurs terres (47,22.26b).

4. Temps racontant et temps raconté

Si l'on s'en tient à la chronologie du récit — Joseph a 17 ans au début (37,2) et meurt à 110 ans à la fin (50,26) — le temps raconté de l'HJ couvre 93 ans. Cependant, la seconde moitié de la vie du héros, soit 55 ans, est condensée en quelques lignes en 50,22-26. L'essentiel de l'histoire dure donc 38 ans — l'âge que Joseph a lorsqu'il retrouve son père en Égypte. Mais de ces années, le narrateur ne retient que quelques moments auxquels il s'attarde parce que s'y produisent des faits significatifs: quelques jours lorsque Joseph a 17 ans (acte I); trois jours durant le séjour cananéen de Juda et trois autres au cours des 20 ans où Joseph réside en Égypte (acte II); une dizaine de jours étalés sur deux ans pour la réconciliation et le regroupement familial (acte III); enfin, 17 ans plus tard, la veille de la mort de Jacob, puis un jour situé quelques mois après son décès (acte IV). Tout le reste est passé sous silence ou comblé de manière condensée par des évocations rapides, des sommaires généralement brefs ou de simples marqueurs temporels. Par cette gestion soigneuse du temps, le narrateur focalise l'attention du lecteur sur les seuls moments cruciaux pour lui laisser le temps d'observer à son aise les personnages et lui permettre de bien saisir les enjeux des événements relatés.

Au fond, on peut dire que la manière de gérer le temps dans l'essentiel de l'HJ ressemble en gros à la manière dont est construit le chapitre 37. Après l'exposition de l'arrière-plan de la crise dont la résolution fait l'objet de l'histoire (vv. 1-4), ce chapitre s'ouvre sur deux petits dialogues autour du récit des rêves par Joseph et de leur interprétation par d'autres (vv. 5-8 et 9-12). Des blancs suivent chacun de ces deux tableaux et ne permettent pas de percevoir quel temps s'écoule entre deux: le narrateur signale seulement la montée de la haine et de la jalousie des frères. Ensuite, le récit est rythmé par les étapes du voyage de Joseph. Le narrateur juxtapose trois petites scènes:

l'envoi par Jacob (vv. 13-14), l'arrivée de Joseph à Sichem où un homme le rencontre (vv. 15-17), le complot des frères au moment où il les trouve (vv. 18-22). Croquées sur le vif grâce aux dialogues, ces scènes contraignent le lecteur à s'arrêter à ces moments importants où la tension narrative croît sans arrêt. À partir de l'arrivée de Joseph auprès des frères, le narrateur focalise l'attention sur les faits dramatiques, dont il relate la séquence continue sur un rythme beaucoup plus soutenu: il enchaîne une série de *wayyiqtol*, interrompue seulement par la description de la caravane qui va emmener Joseph⁽¹⁴⁾. Même le voyage vers Hébron de celui que les frères envoient porter la tunique à Jacob est complètement télescopé (v. 32). Seuls font encore l'objet d'interventions parlées la proposition de Juda de vendre Joseph (vv. 26-27), et, beaucoup plus brièvement, la plainte de Ruben ne trouvant plus l'enfant dans le trou (v. 30b), puis le bref dialogue à distance entre les fils et le père au sujet de la tunique en sang (vv. 32b-33) — toutes paroles de membres du clan, qui servent à dramatiser des moments significatifs en relation avec la disparition de Joseph. Le tempo ne se calme que dans la scène finale du deuil de Jacob, un deuil qu'il prolonge «de nombreux jours» (v. 34b), et que le narrateur met en relief par une dernière parole du vieil homme meurtri répondant aux tentatives de consolation que lui adresse son entourage (v. 35b).

La technique est limpide et tout à fait dans la manière des narrateurs bibliques. L'arrière-plan fait l'objet de sommaires. Les moments essentiels sont dramatisés sous forme de dialogues où le temps racontant se rapproche du temps raconté, d'où la lenteur relative qui contribue à accroître la tension. Ce procédé sera particulièrement employé dans l'acte III où, de manière très scénique, le narrateur rapporte en long et en large les discours de Juda et de Joseph, puis une parole du Pharaon (44,14–45,20), deux pages de texte⁽¹⁵⁾ où le temps

(14) ²³ Lorsque Joseph arriva près de ses frères, ils lui arrachèrent ... ²⁴ ils le prirent et le jetèrent ... ²⁵ et ils s'assirent ... et ils levèrent les yeux et virent ... ²⁶ et Juda dit ... ²⁷ et ses frères écoutèrent ... ²⁸ et passèrent des hommes ... et ils tirèrent et firent monter Joseph ... et ils le vendirent aux Ismaélites ... et ils firent venir... ²⁹ et Ruben retourna ... et il déchira ... ³⁰ et il retourna ... et il dit ... ³¹ et ils prirent ... et ils égorgèrent ... et ils plongèrent ... ³² et ils envoyèrent ... et la firent venir vers Jacob et ils dirent ... ³³ et il la reconnut et il dit ... ³⁴ et il déchira ... et il mit ... et il resta en deuil de nombreux jours.

(15) Dans la *BHS*. Cette scène a la longueur d'un chapitre, soit un cinquième de la durée totale de l'acte III, qui correspond lui-même à une année et demie de temps raconté mais occupe les deux cinquièmes du temps racontant (10 pages sur 26 dans la *BHS*).

racontant se calque de façon presque mimétique sur le temps raconté, signe quasi tangible que l'on est au cœur du récit. Quant aux scènes où l'action importe, elles sont rapportées sur un rythme rapide et bien modulé, quelques paroles venant y souligner des éléments importants. Enfin, le plus souvent, les blancs — ces temps où il n'y a rien à raconter et qui séparent les moments significatifs — sont meublés par des liens temporels qui induisent la continuité narrative de l'ensemble⁽¹⁶⁾ ou par des sommaires conclusifs ou introductifs.

II. Des anticipations en tous genres

Le narrateur de l'HJ n'abuse vraiment pas des prolepses qui lui permettraient de prévenir son lecteur en anticipant sur la suite de l'histoire. Quand il le fait, c'est de manière légère et sans rien compromettre du suspense. En revanche, il aime recourir à des procédés moins directs, au premier rang desquels on trouve les rêves. Il faudra dire un mot également de l'oracle de Béer-Shéva où Dieu anticipe l'avenir par sa promesse à Jacob (46,3-4).

1. *Sommaires proleptiques*

J.L. Ska a déjà mis en évidence dans l'HJ la présence de «sommaires proleptiques» — sorte de titres qui, au début de la narration d'une action, résument celle-ci ou orientent la manière de la lire en attirant l'attention du lecteur sur le «comment?» plutôt que sur le «quoi?»⁽¹⁷⁾. Je relève en particulier 37,21a: lorsque les frères sont en train de comploter tandis que Joseph vient vers eux, le narrateur dit que «Ruben entendit et le sauva de leur main». Il avertit ainsi le lecteur du résultat positif de l'intervention qu'il va raconter ensuite (vv. 21b-24). De même en 45,1b, avant de montrer comment Joseph se fait connaître à ses frères (vv. 4-13), le narrateur indique d'emblée que c'est ce qu'il va faire, de sorte que le lecteur centre son attention sur la manière dont il le fait⁽¹⁸⁾. À ces deux cas mis en évidence par Ska,

⁽¹⁶⁾ Voir BAR-EFRAT, *Narrative Art*, 152-159, surtout 159.

⁽¹⁷⁾ J.L. SKA, «Sommaires proleptiques en Gn 27 et dans l'histoire de Joseph», *Bib* 73 (1992) 518-527, surtout 524.

⁽¹⁸⁾ SKA, «Sommaires», 524, qui cite également 37,18b et 42,7b. Dans le premier cas, *et ils complotèrent contre lui pour le tuer* introduit seulement les paroles de la conspiration (37,19-20); dans le second cas, le narrateur anticipe en précisant la nature des paroles que Joseph va prononcer dans la conversation qui va suivre: *et il leur parla des paroles dures*. Concernant la technique du sommaire

j'ajouterais 41,25, un résumé proleptique à créditer au compte du sens pédagogique de Joseph: pour rassurer le Pharaon sur sa capacité à déchiffrer les rêves et à apaiser l'angoisse qu'ils provoquent, il lui annonce directement l'essentiel de l'interprétation qu'il va développer: «Le rêve de Pharaon est unique: ce que Dieu est sur le point de faire, il l'a annoncé à Pharaon» (cf. vv. 26.28 et 32).

2. Les rêves de Joseph, leurs interprétations et leur réalisation

Venons-en aux rêves de l'HJ et à leur interprétation par les personnages. Les rêves des officiers de la cour d'Égypte et ceux de Pharaon sont clairement présentés par Joseph comme des prolepses, et ce qu'il annonce en les déchiffrant se réalise sans tarder. Le narrateur ne manque d'ailleurs pas de le signaler explicitement (40,22b et 41,54a). À l'intérieur de chaque épisode, ces prolepses ménagent un certain suspense, la première fois, en tout cas⁽¹⁹⁾. La chose est moins claire pour les rêves de Joseph (37,5-11).

(a) Que ces rêves puissent être une *annonce de l'avenir*, soit. C'est naturellement ainsi que les frères et Jacob interprètent la chose. Pourtant, le narrateur ne le confirme pas, car il ne précise nulle part que Dieu est impliqué d'une manière ou d'une autre dans ces rêves⁽²⁰⁾. Sur ce point, Joseph diffère des rêveurs qui le précèdent en Genèse et qui reçoivent de Dieu lui-même le sens du rêve où il apparaît ou parle (20,3.6; 28,12-15; 31,10-13, cf. v. 3; et 31,24). Dans le cas de Joseph,

proleptique, voir J.L. SKA, «Quelques exemples de sommaires proleptiques dans les récits bibliques», *Congress Volume, Paris 1992* (ed. J.A. EMERTON) (VTS 61; Leiden 1995) 315-326.

⁽¹⁹⁾ Voir en 40,20-22, dans le récit de la réalisation de l'annonce faite par Joseph, le jeu de mots sur l'expression עֲנִי וְאֶתְּנָהּ לְךָ: à cause de l'ambiguïté créée par Joseph lui-même aux vv. 13 et 19, ce jeu de mots fait craindre un moment qu'il ait pu se tromper, mais cela se retourne ironiquement aux dépens du panetier pendu.

⁽²⁰⁾ Interprètent les rêves de Joseph comme une communication divine, p. ex. H. GUNKEL, *Genesis übersetzt und erklärt* (Göttingen 1977) 405; R. LACK, *Lecture strutturaliste dell'antico testamento* (Roma 1978) 104, ou A. SCHENKER, *Chemins bibliques de la non-violence* (Chambéry 1987) 13-40 (cf. n. 17, p. 154). A. DA SILVA, *La symbolique des rêves et des vêtements dans l'histoire de Joseph et de ses frères* (CTHP 52; Québec 1994) 42-50, montre que, dans la Bible, cela n'est pas forcément le cas (voir ainsi Dt 13,2.4; Jr 23,25.28; Jb 20,8; Si 34,1-8). Quant à C. WESTERMANN, *Genesis 3. Genesis 37–50* (BKAT I/3; Neukirchen 1982) 30, il souligne que le texte ne parle pas d'intervention de Dieu: «von einem Wort Gottes an Joseph durch den Traum ist nicht die Rede». Dans le même sens: G.J. WENHAM, *Genesis 16–50* (WBC 2; Dallas 1994) 351.

le narrateur laisse planer un doute que reflète peut-être la forme interrogative des interprétations données par les familiers. Et si le lecteur peut légitimement supposer que Dieu intervient comme auparavant pour anticiper l'avenir par un songe, il ne peut en être certain faute de confirmation autorisée. Pour savoir ce qu'il en est, le lecteur devra attendre la suite du récit. Mais au début de l'histoire, il n'a pas de raison d'exclure a priori que les rêves puissent être le simple reflet de la vanité du jeune Joseph⁽²¹⁾.

(b) Quoi qu'il en soit, les rêves amorcent une attente chez le lecteur. Mais les choses ne sont pas claires, d'autant que la question se pose de savoir *ce que ces rêves annoncent* s'ils sont prémonitoires. Joseph raconte les rêves mais ne les interprète pas. Ce sont les frères et le père qui le font, et nul ne dit qu'ils sont crédibles dans cet exercice⁽²²⁾. Aussi, à côté de leur interprétation, il y a peut-être place pour une autre lecture, que la formulation ambivalente de leurs interprétations suggère déjà. En effet, on peut entendre celles-ci de deux manières: à première lecture, les rêves de Joseph sont pour eux des annonces de son destin; mais on ne peut exclure qu'ils y voient l'expression de ses désirs de grandeur. Du reste, l'emploi de l'infinitif absolu, qui peut conférer une nuance modale au *yiqtol* des verbes, permet une double traduction: on pourrait donc les rendre par un futur, éventuellement avec une nuance de doute («régneras-tu vraiment...?» et «viendrons-nous vraiment...?»), ou par une expression mettant en valeur les nuances modales du vouloir, d'abord («voudrais-tu régner...?»; v. 8), puis du devoir («devrons-nous venir...?»; v. 10b)⁽²³⁾.

⁽²¹⁾ À la suite de G. VON RAD, *Das erste Buch Mose*. Genesis (ATD; Göttingen 1967) 307-308; V.P. HAMILTON, *The Book of Genesis*. Chapters 18-50 (NICOT; Grand Rapids 1995) 410, souligne bien que l'absence de référence à Dieu confère aux rêves un caractère ambigu: «is the dream an exhibition of hybris or is it a prophecy?»; voir aussi WENHAM, *Genesis 16-50*, 351. ALONSO SCHÖKEL, *Dov'è tuo fratello?*, 313, est plus réservé quand il se demande si le rêve vient de Dieu ou de la fantaisie de Joseph.

⁽²²⁾ R. PIRSON, «The Sun, the Moon and Eleven Stars: an Interpretation of Joseph's Second Dream», *Studies in the Book of Genesis* (ed. A. WÉNIN) (BETL 155; Leuven 2001) 563, conteste même radicalement la lecture de Jacob.

⁽²³⁾ Selon P. JOÛON, *Grammaire de l'hébreu biblique* (Rome 1965) § 123 h, l'infinitif absolu préposé peut signaler une nuance modale de pouvoir et de devoir dans un verbe à l'inaccompli (pour ces nuances, voir § 113 l et m). Lui-même opte pour la nuance d'improbabilité que l'infinitif induirait (§ 123 f). Ces remarques sont reprises telles quelles dans l'édition de Muraoka (P. JOÛON, *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew*. Translated and Revised by T. Muraoka [SubBib 14; Roma 1996]). Parmi les traductions courantes en français, la Bible Osty et la TOB ont choisi de rendre ces nuances modales.

Ainsi donc, d'un côté, les rêves pourraient être une annonce du futur, et les auditeurs de Joseph les comprennent peut-être en ce sens. Pour les *frères*, le premier rêve annonce la future domination royale de Joseph (מֶלֶךְ et מִשָּׁל). Les verbes sont forts, et ils témoignent sans doute de l'état d'esprit des frères qui contestent implicitement ce qu'ils comprennent du rêve (v. 8). Leur ton trahit une certaine agressivité, signe des craintes que le récit de Joseph éveille en eux⁽²⁴⁾. Quant au *père*, il se limite à dire ce que représentent à ses yeux les astres se prosternant devant Joseph. Il prend néanmoins la situation au sérieux: d'une part, il gronde son fils et l'interroge sur le rêve (v. 10); d'autre part, il garde la chose (v. 11b). Il faut ajouter que, aux questions peut-être rhétoriques qui lui sont adressées quant au sens de ses rêves, Joseph ne répond pas, lui qui, plus tard, s'avérera être un interprète inspiré. Il ne se prononce donc pas lui-même sur les interprétations entendues. Serait-il perplexe quant au sens de ses rêves?

D'un autre côté, je l'ai montré, le lecteur ne peut exclure que les rêves expriment les désirs de Joseph. Mais ceux-ci n'ont peut-être pas le sens que ses familiers lui prêtent. Car le narrateur introduit les rêves juste après avoir campé la situation de Joseph au sein de sa famille. Dans ce contexte, les rêves pourraient exprimer les désirs enfouis qui sont les siens dans la situation⁽²⁵⁾. Joseph se trouve dans une position difficile pour le jeune homme qu'il est (37,2-4). L'amour de son père fait de lui l'objet de la haine de ses frères, le plongeant ainsi au cœur d'une contradiction. De plus, doublement inférieur à ses frères, comme cadet et serviteur (עָבֵד), il est élevé par Jacob qui lui donne une robe en signe de son statut particulier. Ainsi placé au centre de la fratrie, Joseph en compromet l'unité et en menace gravement la paix. Sur cet arrière plan, de quel désir ses rêves pourraient-ils être l'expression, sinon du désir que cette tension, difficilement supportable à terme, se résorbe, et se résorbe à son avantage? En ce sens, le premier rêve dirait son désir d'être reconnu par ses frères comme centre d'une fratrie unie

⁽²⁴⁾ En ce sens, p. ex., HETTEMA, *Reading for Good*, 174; et déjà VON RAD, *Das erste Buch Mose*, 308.

⁽²⁵⁾ Sur cette question, voir P. GIBERT, *Le récit biblique de rêve*. Essai de confrontation analytique (Profac – Série Biblique 3; Lyon 1990) 23-29. Il traite de Gn 37,2-12 aux p. 43-55. On se rappellera que, pour Freud, le rêve constitue la réalisation d'un désir inconscient du rêveur. N.M. SARNA, *Genesis. The Traditional Hebrew Text with the New JPS Translation* (JPS Torah Commentary; Philadelphia 1989) 256, reconnaît lui aussi que les rêves, en plus d'être un message de la divinité, peuvent aussi refléter la personnalité du rêveur, ses désirs et ses souhaits.

autour de lui⁽²⁶⁾, puisqu'il y voit les frères lui reconnaître la place de choix que son père lui réserve déjà. Du coup, en rêve, son désir d'être le premier — frustré à cause de sa position de נער — se réalise en même temps que l'unité de la fratrie. Le second rêve dit un désir analogue. Mais cette fois, Joseph y est présent en personne, vénéré par les astres: aussi Gibert a-t-il probablement raison de voir là le signe d'un narcissisme que le jeune Joseph n'a pas encore dépassé⁽²⁷⁾ et qui sera bientôt mis à mal par les épreuves qu'il va traverser.

(c) Sur cette base, on peut chercher à voir si, dans la suite du récit, les rêves se confirment comme annonces du futur et si oui, en quel sens. Comme tous les commentateurs le notent, le premier rêve se réalise *selon l'interprétation des frères* quand ceux-ci se prosternent devant Joseph dans des circonstances liées à la récolte — les gerbes du rêve⁽²⁸⁾ — où Joseph a acquis son pouvoir (42,6; 43,26.28)⁽²⁹⁾. Mais la lecture des frères n'est exacte que sur ce point. Car Joseph ne «règnera» pas. Le narrateur le décrit comme שלֵט (gouverneur en 42,6, cf. 41,40) et c'est sur l'Égypte et non pas sur ses frères; du reste, il montrera Joseph refuser à plusieurs reprises que ceux-ci deviennent ses serviteurs (44,16-17.33 et 50,18-21). Devant leur père, les frères l'évoqueront comme «l'homme maître de la terre» (42,30.33: דָּאֵשׁ אֲדֹנֵי הָאָרֶץ). Quant à Joseph, il se décrira comme מֶשֶׁל בְּכָל־אֶרֶץ מִצְרַיִם, «gouvernant sur toute la terre d'Égypte» (45,8), un titre que ses frères reprendront un peu plus tard (46,26). Mais si l'interprétation des frères ne se réalise que partiellement, en revanche, *le rêve s'accomplit* d'une façon que ceux-ci n'ont pas prévue: lorsque Joseph a amassé le grain récolté durant les années d'abondance, la famille se réunit autour de lui et il veille à les nourrir. Si le désir caché de Joseph «révélé» par les rêves est la réunion familiale autour de lui, alors il s'accomplit bien au terme de l'histoire.

Quant à *l'interprétation du second rêve par Jacob*, elle ne se concrétise que très partiellement dans la suite de l'histoire. La mère de

⁽²⁶⁾ En ce sens, GIBERT, *Le récit biblique de rêve*, 44-45.

⁽²⁷⁾ GIBERT, *Le récit biblique de rêve*, 54.

⁽²⁸⁾ Voir en ce sens, GUNKEL, *Genesis*, 404, puis J.G. JANZEN, *Abraham and All the Families of the Earth. A Commentary on the Book of Genesis 12–50* (ITC; Grand Rapids – Edinburgh 1993) 149, et DA SILVA, *La symbolique*, 68.

⁽²⁹⁾ En 44,14 et 50,18, l'expression est différente ([וַיִּפְּלוּ לְפָנָיו] אֲרָצָה) tout comme le contexte: il s'agit de se jeter aux pieds de quelqu'un dans un geste d'imploration en vue d'obtenir pitié suite à des fautes que l'on avoue; voir aussi PIRSON, «The Sun, the Moon», 567, n. 15.

Joseph est morte⁽³⁰⁾, et Jacob ne se prosternera pas devant son fils⁽³¹⁾. Seule se réalise donc la «venue» à laquelle l'interprétation de Jacob — mais pas le rêve lui-même! — faisait allusion. De plus, cette venue s'effectue en un tout autre sens que celui que Jacob lui donnait (voir 46,6-7). Mais ici aussi, le rêve se réalise peut-être autrement. Car depuis Gn 1,14-18, les astres sont signes de la succession du temps. Le fait qu'ils se prosternent ici devant Joseph n'annonce-t-il pas ce qui se produit lorsque Joseph anticipe sur les temps de la terre, comme si ceux-ci se pliaient à ses paroles, treize ans (11+2) après le rêve (cf. 41,53-54)⁽³²⁾? Mais alors, comme dans les autres rêves de l'HJ où des chiffres interviennent, ceux-ci seraient à lire en clé temporelle, et le rêve n'aurait rien à voir avec le prosternement dont parle Jacob⁽³³⁾.

Ainsi donc, au vu de l'ensemble de l'HJ, les rêves de Joseph s'avèrent effectivement prémonitoires. Mais, si le lecteur se fie aux interprétations données par les acteurs, il risque de se laisser induire en erreur. Car la réalisation des rêves déborde le déchiffrement restrictif que les familiers de Joseph en donnent sous le coup de la crainte, de la

⁽³⁰⁾ Rachel est morte avant le début de cette histoire, et en tout cas, de son vivant, Joseph n'avait que dix frères, puisque sa mère meurt en donnant le jour à Benjamin (cf. 35,16-19). Aussi, l'interprétation de Jacob est fautive de toute manière. Mais elle est peut-être ironique: en disant à Joseph que sa mère, pourtant morte, devrait venir s'incliner devant lui, Jacob exprime indirectement son scepticisme, suggérant qu'il est impossible que le rêve se réalise. Un tel sens est cohérent avec la réaction dure de Jacob qui réprimande le rêveur (37,10). En ce sens, voir p. ex. la lecture de E.I. LOWENTHAL, *The Joseph Narrative in Genesis. An Interpretation* (New York 1973) 20; J. EISENBERG – B. GROSS, *Un messie nommé Joseph. À Bible ouverte V* (Présences du Judaïsme; Paris 1983) 81-82, et PIRSON, «The Sun, the Moon», 563.

⁽³¹⁾ En 47,31, le narrateur parle d'une prosternation d'Israël en présence de Joseph, mais ce n'est pas devant lui qu'il s'incline, mais devant Dieu en signe d'action de grâce (voir déjà Rachi). En ce sens: WESTERMANN, *Genesis 37–50*, 183, et HETTEMA, *Reading for Good*, 206-207, qui renvoient à 1 R 1,47-48 pour un geste semblable chez David. En sens inverse, p. ex., R. DE HOOP, *Genesis 49 in its Literary and Historical Context* (Leiden 1998) 328-332, ou G. FISCHER, «Die Josefsgeschichte als Modell für Versöhnung», *Studies in the Book of Genesis* (ed. WÉNIN) (BETL 155; Leuven 2001) 255.

⁽³²⁾ Voir JANZEN, *Abraham and All the Families*, 149: «...the second [dream] speaks of him [Joseph] as a master of times and seasons (cf. Gen. 1:14-19)».

⁽³³⁾ Ainsi, PIRSON, «The Sun, the Moon», 561-568: la somme de 11 et 2 fait 13, le nombre d'années qui s'écoulent avant l'arrivée de Joseph au pouvoir; le produit de la multiplication de ces chiffres est 22, le nombre d'années qui passent jusqu'à ce que se réalise le premier rêve (*tous* les frères se prosternent). On ajoutera que le 2 à part du 11 pourrait renvoyer aux 2 années passées en prison par Joseph suite à l'oubli de l'échanson (41,1).

jalousie ou de l'émotion. En particulier, s'accomplit le côté positif que l'aveuglement des interprètes laisse entièrement dans l'ombre. La scène des rêves constitue donc effectivement une anticipation de l'histoire, un programme pour l'ensemble du récit⁽³⁴⁾. Mais ce n'est qu'après coup que le lecteur attentif qui, à partir du récit de Joseph, a perçu quelque chose de l'ambivalence des rêves verra comment ceux-ci se réalisent, si du moins il ne s'en tient pas à la lecture restrictive qu'en donnent des personnages à l'inspiration douteuse. Ainsi, ce «programme» reste crypté jusqu'au moment où le maître des songes, pour avoir déchiffré correctement les rêves des Égyptiens, atteint une position où il pourra faire en sorte que ses propres rêves deviennent réalité. À ce moment-là, le lecteur devra se demander dans quel sens Joseph va s'orienter lorsqu'il se souvient de ses rêves (42,9): va-t-il choisir de dominer ses frères selon leur interprétation, ou au contraire va-t-il laisser prévaloir le désir d'unité que suggérerait le premier rêve? Tout au long de l'entrevue initiale au cours de laquelle Joseph se montre dur envers ses frères (42,6-17), le narrateur entretiendra l'indécision du lecteur sur cette question⁽³⁵⁾.

3. *L'oracle divin de Béer-Shèva (46,3-4)*

On trouve un dernier cas d'anticipation de l'avenir dans l'oracle dont Dieu gratifie Israël au moment où il s'apprête à descendre en Égypte (46,3-4). Dans les visions de la nuit (בְּמַרְאֵי הַלַּיְלָה) — détail qui apparente la scène à un rêve —, il lui annonce plusieurs choses, dans la ligne des anciennes promesses à Abraham et à Isaac, pour lui donner confiance et l'engager à se rendre là-bas, alors qu'il avait interdit à son père Isaac d'entreprendre ce voyage pour fuir une famine (26,2-4a): [1] en Égypte, Dieu fera de Jacob une grande nation (46,3b), [2] il descendra avec lui dans ce pays, [3] il l'en fera remonter, et [4] et Joseph lui fermera les yeux (v. 4). Ce qui est annoncé de la sorte, ce

⁽³⁴⁾ Avec VON RAD, *Das erste Buch Mose*, 307, et d'autres, J.-M. HUSSER, *Le songe et la parole. Étude sur le rêve et sa fonction dans l'ancien Israël* (BZAW 210; Berlin – New York 1994) 237. Voir aussi DA SILVA, *La symbolique*, 74.

⁽³⁵⁾ On n'a pas assez insisté sur un fait curieux: Joseph ne se souvient pas des rêves juste après le premier prosternement des frères en 42,6b, comme cela aurait été naturel, mais après un léger délai, lorsqu'il constate que les frères ne le reconnaissent pas d'eux-mêmes (v. 9). Le narrateur semble donc lier le souvenir des rêves non au prosternement qui précède, mais à la suite immédiate où Joseph secoue ses frères en les accusant d'espionnage. Voir cependant HAMILTON, *Genesis 18–50*, 520.

n'est pas seulement ni peut-être même d'abord le début du livre de l'Exode, comme le soulignent certains commentateurs⁽³⁶⁾; c'est aussi le dernier acte de l'HJ (47,27–50,26).

La première partie de la promesse se réalise dès le début de l'acte. En effet, pour devenir en Égypte une grande nation, Jacob doit nécessairement s'y installer. Le narrateur ne manque pas d'enregistrer le fait en 47,27: «Israël habita au pays d'Égypte, au pays de Goshen, et ils y devinrent propriétaires, et ils fructifièrent et multiplièrent beaucoup». Concernant la deuxième annonce, le narrateur ne précise pas que Dieu est avec Jacob durant son séjour en Égypte. Mais lorsqu'il bénit les fils de Joseph, Jacob le reconnaît implicitement en disant de Dieu qu'il fut son berger jusqu'à ce jour, et en évoquant l'ange qui l'a délivré de tout mal (48,15-16). Pour ce qui est de son retour en Canaan, le vieux Jacob en parle deux fois à ses fils, comme s'il voulait s'assurer auprès d'eux qu'ils accompliront la promesse divine: avant de bénir les fils de Joseph, il lui demande de ne pas l'enterrer en Égypte mais dans le tombeau de ses pères (47,29-31); et après avoir béni ses fils, il leur répète ses dernières volontés en donnant toutes les précisions nécessaires (49,29-32)⁽³⁷⁾. Cette «montée» de Jacob vers Canaan (עֲלֵה [50,5.6.7².9]), à laquelle Pharaon aurait pu s'opposer (cf. vv. 4-6), occupe la moitié du chapitre 50 (vv. 4-13). Enfin, au moment de sa mort, comme Dieu l'a dit, Joseph est le premier à rendre honneur à son père avec une émotion non dissimulée (50,1). Dans ces conditions, l'oracle de Béer-Shèva fait figure de prolepse des derniers événements de la vie de Jacob.

Ceci dit, les dernières paroles du patriarches ont elles aussi un caractère proleptique. Mais cette fois, c'est pour annoncer un futur qui déborde l'HJ et le livre de la Genèse. Il faut néanmoins souligner que, dans ses dernières paroles à Joseph, Jacob lui-même interprétera la promesse de Béer-Shèva en lui donnant un sens plus large: «Voici que je vais mourir, dit-il: Dieu sera avec vous et il vous fera revenir vers le pays de vos pères» (48,21). Joseph à son tour, juste avant sa mort, transmettra cette promesse aux «fils d'Israël» en déclarant: «Je vais mourir, mais Dieu vous visitera certainement et il vous fera monter de ce pays vers le pays qu'il a juré à Abraham, à Isaac et à Jacob» (50,24). C'est l'exode qui est ainsi directement annoncé.

⁽³⁶⁾ Voir p. ex. WESTERMANN, *Genesis 37–50*, 172, ou HAMILTON, *Genesis 18–50*, 592. Certes les trois premières annonces où Dieu s'engage visent aussi la première partie de Ex, mais la fin de Gn les réalise déjà d'une première manière.

⁽³⁷⁾ Ce sont les première et dernière paroles de Jacob dans cet acte.

III. Divers retours sur le passé

Dans son récit, je l'ai dit, le narrateur ne s'écarte guère de l'ordre chronologique des faits rapportés. Aussi, on ne sera pas surpris qu'il utilise peu le procédé de l'analepse qui consiste à introduire à un certain point de l'histoire un élément antérieur qui, pour des raisons narratives, n'a pas été révélé au moment où il s'est produit. Par contre, le narrateur de l'HJ affectionne les reprises par des personnages de faits déjà relatés, que ce soit pour les raconter à leur manière ou pour en donner leur interprétation — un procédé dont on sait qu'il est souvent révélateur des personnages et de leur face cachée, mais qui ralentit aussi le rythme de la narration, contribuant à en accroître la tension.

1. *Quelques analepses*

(a) Le narrateur recourt à l'analepse à deux reprises à la fin de la première rencontre entre Joseph et ses frères en Égypte⁽³⁸⁾. Il y a d'abord la mention tardive de la présence d'un interprète lors de la première rencontre entre Joseph et les frères en Égypte⁽³⁹⁾. Le narrateur raconte une première entrevue et le début d'une seconde sans révéler au lecteur la présence d'un traducteur entre le gouverneur et les frères. Il dévoile seulement ce détail après que les frères ont reconnu leur insensibilité coupable vis-à-vis de leur jeune frère, aveu dont Ruben profite pour leur révéler qu'il n'était pas d'accord avec eux (42,21-23). À ce moment, précise le narrateur, ils ne savent pas que Joseph comprend ce qu'ils disent (v. 24) puisque la présence de l'interprète leur laisse croire que le gouverneur ne connaît pas leur langue. Pourtant Joseph entend, et il sort pleurer.

Pourquoi le narrateur garde-t-il jusqu'ici l'information qu'il aurait pu donner au début de la scène⁽⁴⁰⁾, en 42,7a, par exemple, lorsqu'il dit

⁽³⁸⁾ En 48,6, Jacob parle à Joseph de «l'enfantement que tu as enfanté après eux» (Manassé et Éphraïm), et dont le narrateur ne dit mot par ailleurs. S'agit-il aussi d'une analepse par laquelle le narrateur comble une ellipse en utilisant les paroles de Jacob? Ou est-ce pour Jacob une façon d'adoucir le fait qu'il prive Joseph de ses deux fils (voir DE HOOP, *Genesis* 49, 338)?

⁽³⁹⁾ Sur ce passage, voir en particulier ALTER, *The Art*, 167, et HETTEMA, *Reading for Good*, 198-200.

⁽⁴⁰⁾ Il est fréquent dans l'A.T. qu'un narrateur taise des éléments d'exposition et les introduise au moment où ceux-ci sont nécessaires à la compréhension de l'action. Cf. p. ex. BAR-EFRAT, *Narrative Art*, 111-121, ou SKA, "Our Fathers", 23.

que Joseph joue les inconnus envers ceux qu'il reconnaît comme ses frères? D'abord, en procédant de la sorte, le narrateur souligne bien que Joseph surprend des paroles qui ne lui sont pas adressées, alors qu'elles le concernent au premier chef et qu'elles sont de nature à le bouleverser⁽⁴¹⁾. Mais il peut aussi vouloir suggérer que ce n'est pas parce qu'ils se savent reconnus que les frères avouent leur faute: ils le font spontanément, sans que quiconque leur ait arraché cet aveu, parce qu'ils prennent conscience de ce que leur victime a vécu. Enfin, a posteriori, le lecteur voit quel moyen concret Joseph a mis en œuvre pour se dissimuler. Mais plus profondément, il apprend aussi qu'au moment où le dialogue reprend entre les fils de Jacob, un traducteur les sépare et incarne, pour ainsi dire, leur difficulté à communiquer entre eux depuis que la haine a commencé à rendre toute parole de paix impossible dans la famille (cf. 37,2-4).

(b) Dans le même épisode, une autre analepse vient combler une ellipse bien plus ancienne puisqu'elle se situe au chapitre 37⁽⁴²⁾. Quand les frères avouent leur faute, ils évoquent les cris de leur frère lorsqu'ils lui ont mis la main dessus: «Nous avons vu la détresse de son âme quand il implorait grâce vers nous et que nous n'avons pas écouté» (42,21a). Dans le récit du chapitre 37, Joseph reste silencieux: le narrateur n'enregistre aucune réaction de sa part. Or, les frères nous apprennent que Joseph a bel et bien réagi en leur montrant sa détresse et en les suppliant. Pourquoi alors le narrateur choisit-il de passer cela sous silence dans son récit? Sans doute veut-il raconter toute la scène du chapitre 37 dans la perspective des frères⁽⁴³⁾. Comme ceux-ci sont sourds aux cris de Joseph, il ne les fait pas entendre non plus au lecteur, lui donnant le sentiment que Joseph ne compte pas pour eux. À partir du moment où ses frères le voient arriver, en effet, il n'est à leurs yeux qu'un objet, l'objet de leur haine meurtrière — et ce n'est pas un hasard si, désormais, leur victime reste entièrement passive et n'est plus jamais sujet d'un verbe jusqu'à la fin de l'épisode, si ce n'est du prédicat qui le nie par deux fois, **אֵין יוֹסֵף**: Joseph n'est pas (v. 29, redit par Ruben au v. 30). Sans doute est-ce là un signe de la «mise à

⁽⁴¹⁾ On peut souligner aussi l'ironie du narrateur: alors que les frères viennent d'avouer qu'ils n'ont pas *écouté* leur frère (v. 21) et que Ruben vient de leur reprocher de ne pas avoir *écouté* son intervention en sa faveur (v. 22), Joseph, lui, les *écoute*, les *entend* et les *comprend* (trois sens simultanés de שמע au v. 24).

⁽⁴²⁾ Cette ellipse est relevée par LACK, *Lecture strutturaliste*, 69-70, et SKA, *Our Fathers*, 9.

⁽⁴³⁾ En ce sens, HETTEMA, *Reading for Good*, 177.

mort symbolique» de ce personnage qui ne figure plus dans le récit qu'en tant qu'objet de l'agir ou de paroles d'autres⁽⁴⁴⁾.

Mais la question se pose aussi de savoir pourquoi le narrateur introduit cet élément à l'endroit où le lecteur le lit. Il est permis de penser que, ayant choisi de relater l'agression de Joseph à partir de la perspective des frères, le narrateur attend que ceux-ci reprennent conscience de cette faute rapidement refoulée pour mettre le lecteur au courant. Mais pourquoi se souviennent-ils ici? Le contexte permet de le deviner. Le gouverneur égyptien vient de décréter que les frères vont devoir rentrer avec un frère de moins chez leur père et demander à celui-ci de laisser partir avec eux leur petit frère, le fils de Rachel qu'il a gardé avec lui (vv. 18-20, cf. 42,13). Ils se trouvent donc contraints d'affronter un retour qui leur rappelle celui du chapitre 37, lorsqu'ils ont privé leur vieux père de son bien-aimé en rentrant sans leur jeune frère et qu'ils ont provoqué chez lui une douleur inconsolable. L'angoisse qu'ils éprouvent à la pensée de revivre ces événements leur fait saisir de l'intérieur ce que Joseph a vécu — ils font d'ailleurs explicitement le parallèle entre la détresse qu'ils vivent et celle qu'ils ont vue chez leur frère (צרה)⁽⁴⁵⁾. C'est cette détresse qui leur ouvre les oreilles, si l'on peut dire, et ils se souviennent enfin de ce qu'ils ont refusé d'entendre alors. Une fois entendus, les cris de Joseph leur font prendre conscience à présent de leur insensibilité coupable. C'est ainsi que le lecteur apprend comment Joseph a réagi lorsque ses frères l'agressaient.

(c) Un autre cas d'analepse dans la bouche des frères est tout aussi clair, mais beaucoup plus suspect. Après la mort et l'enterrement de Jacob, ceux-ci redoutent que Joseph veuille se venger, à présent que leur père n'est plus (50,15)⁽⁴⁶⁾. Aussi, prennent-ils l'initiative

⁽⁴⁴⁾ Le dernier verbe qui a Joseph pour sujet est celui de son arrivée au v. 23a. Après, il est l'objet des actions des autres personnages (vv. 23, 24², 28³, 31-32 [la tunique], 34, 35) ou de leurs discours (vv. 26², 32, 33, 35, 36).

⁽⁴⁵⁾ Sur ceci, SCHENKER, *Chemins bibliques*, 25-26, et FISCHER, «Josefsgeschichte», 249-250 qui précise que l'intervention de Ruben (42,22), se désolidarisant de ses frères comme en 37,21-22.29, complète le lien avec les événements de Dotan. J'ajouterais que, cette fois, c'est Joseph qui apprend quelque chose qu'il ignorait.

⁽⁴⁶⁾ Comme le suggère JANZEN, *Abraham and All the Families*, 201, les frères réagissent en fonction de leur culpabilité. Il semblent projeter chez Joseph ce qui fut la logique d'Ésaü victime de son frère: par respect pour un père dont il était le préféré, il différa son projet de se venger de son frère (27,41, avec le même verbe צוֹרֵר). Ce rapprochement avec Ésaü est fréquent: voir p. ex. ALONSO SCHÖKEL, *Dov'è tuo fratello?*, 378-379.

d'implorer le pardon de leur frère. Ils le font en s'appuyant sur une parole du père que le narrateur n'a pas rapportée en son temps. «Ton père a donné un ordre avant de mourir en disant: "ainsi parlerez-vous à Joseph: de grâce, je t'en prie, enlève le crime de tes frères et leur péché car c'est du mal qu'ils t'ont fait". Et maintenant, je t'en prie, enlève le crime des serviteurs du Dieu de ton père» (50,16-17).

La question ici est de savoir si Jacob a jamais tenu un tel discours. Le narrateur a en effet relaté de nombreuses paroles de Jacob avant sa mort (entre 47,29 et 49,32), mais pas celle-là⁽⁴⁷⁾. Il ne parle même pas d'une entrevue entre les frères et leur père à laquelle Joseph n'assisterait pas. En outre, il ne fait pas état d'un rapport à Jacob de ce qui s'est passé entre les frères. Aussi, le lecteur peut nourrir quelque doute. Le narrateur, en effet, laisse aux frères l'entière responsabilité de leurs paroles et il précise que ce qui les pousse à parler ainsi, c'est la crainte, le désir de se protéger de Joseph (50,15)⁽⁴⁸⁾. Du reste, ils ne se présentent pas eux-mêmes devant leur frère, mais dépêchent un porte-parole, comme au début, lorsqu'ils renvoyèrent la tunique à leur père. Ne seraient-ils donc pas en train de ruser à nouveau⁽⁴⁹⁾? En tout cas, le lecteur a des raisons d'hésiter. Les frères pourraient bien inventer de toutes pièces une parole qui leur permet de s'appuyer sur l'autorité du disparu pour obtenir le pardon qu'ils désirent, en spéculant sur le fait qu'un fils bien-aimé n'osera pas s'opposer aux dernières volontés de son père.

Au demeurant, la formulation de la supplique tend à confirmer ces soupçons, dans la mesure où les frères font tout pour que leurs paroles touchent Joseph. D'une part, ils présentent leur démarche comme l'exécution d'un ordre formel reçu de leur père. Mais pourquoi donc Jacob aurait-il donné cet ordre à ses fils plutôt que de l'adresser lui-

⁽⁴⁷⁾ En ce sens, p. ex., SARNA, *Genesis*, 349-350. Pour W. BRUEGGEMANN, «Genesis L 15-21: a theological exploration», *Congress Volume, Salamanca 1983* (ed. J.A. EMERTON) (VTS 36; Leiden 1985) 40-53, on ne sait pas si Jacob a prononcé de telles paroles.

⁽⁴⁸⁾ En ce sens, M. STERNBERG, *The Poetics of Biblical Narrative*. Ideological Literature and the Drama of Reading (Bloomington 1985) 379, écrit: «Taken together with the emphasis on the brothers' fear of revenge, (...) their unsupported report makes sense as a desperate fabrication». Voir aussi WENHAM, *Genesis 16–50*, 490. VON RAD, *Das erste Buch Mose*, 349-350, ne partage pas cet avis qui est pour lui une «ganz irrigte Annahme».

⁽⁴⁹⁾ Voir HAMILTON, *Genesis 18–50*, 702: envoyer un message est une façon d'éviter la confrontation avec quelqu'un que l'on craint comme un adversaire. Cet auteur renvoie à ce que Jacob fait avant de rencontrer Ésaü en Gn 32. Voir aussi VON RAD, *Das erste Buch Mose*, 377, et WESTERMANN, *Genesis 37–50*, 231.

même à Joseph — n'en a-t-il pas eu l'occasion? D'autre part, leur rhétorique se veut convaincante. Le mot אָבִיךָ, «ton père», enserme leur discours comme pour souligner le lien privilégié entre père et fils, lien auquel les frères en appellent; au centre, ce père nomme les fautifs «tes frères» (אֶחָיו), un nom encadré par des mots qui les désignent comme coupables (פָּשָׁע et חַטָּאת). Ainsi: ton père à toi dit que nous sommes *tes frères*, malgré le crime et le péché envers toi: pardonne donc (2 fois שָׁנָה). Bref, face à cette analepse, le lecteur peut difficilement ne pas penser qu'il s'agit là d'une ultime ruse des frères. Mais ce mensonge, qui témoigne de leur peur et de leur défiance, est néanmoins habité par la vérité d'un aveu indirect.

2. Retours sur l'histoire vécue

(a) Dans une aussi longue histoire, le narrateur a souvent l'occasion d'opérer des retours en arrière pour revenir, dans les paroles de ses personnages, sur des événements déjà racontés. Certes, ce phénomène relève en partie de l'usage narratif de la répétition et s'avère essentiel pour la caractérisation des personnages. Il a néanmoins un aspect temporel important. Ainsi, certains de ces discours ralentissent le tempo narratif pour permettre au lecteur, qui sait déjà de quoi il est question, de centrer son attention sur d'autres points que les faits racontés. Mais aussi, ces retours «replient» le récit sur lui-même, invitant le lecteur à revenir sur le passé en même temps que les personnages, pour en mesurer l'impact sur le présent (et sur l'avenir). Ils contribuent ainsi à unifier le temps du récit tout en dévoilant son épaisseur et en permettant de prendre la mesure du rôle que joue le temps dans le pourrissement ou au contraire dans le déblocage des situations racontées, dans la stagnation ou le mûrissement des personnages.

Ainsi, à plusieurs reprises, Joseph évoque son passé malheureux: devant l'échanson de Pharaon (40,15), en commentant le nom de Manassé (41,51) et quand il se donne à connaître par ses frères et les met au courant de qui concerne la famine, choses que le lecteur sait mais que les frères ignorent (45,4-8). Par ailleurs, on le voit aussi faire rejouer par ses frères, mais à leur insu, des scénarios qui les ramènent vingt ans plus tôt; j'en ai donné un exemple ci-dessus (cf. III.1.b) et je n'y reviens pas. De façon analogue, lorsqu'il fait cacher sa coupe dans le sac de Benjamin, puis qu'il fait rattraper le groupe pour l'accuser de vol et fouiller les sacs en vue de les confondre (44,1-12), Joseph s'inspire sans doute de l'histoire de sa mère, Rachel, dont les frères

ont été témoins avec lui: le vol des dieux de Laban qu'elle cache dans ses bagages et qui donne lieu à une poursuite, à une accusation puis à une fouille publique, infructueuse celle-là (31,19-35)⁽⁵⁰⁾. De son côté, Jacob revient ici et là au fil de l'histoire sur des événements passés pour expliquer l'attitude qu'il adopte ou pour se plaindre de ses fils (42,4, puis 36 et 38; 43,7.12). À la fin de sa vie, il évoque devant eux quelques moments forts de sa vie: les visites de Dieu (48,3-4) et son accompagnement constant (48,15-16); la mort de Rachel (48,7), son désespoir suite à la disparition de Joseph (48,11), l'injure que Ruben lui a infligée (49,4) ou la fureur vengeresse de Siméon et Lévi (49,5-7)⁽⁵¹⁾.

Mais c'est dans l'acte central et avec les frères que le narrateur démontre la maîtrise qu'il a de cette technique. Ainsi, rentrés de leur premier voyage en Égypte, les frères font rapport à Jacob de ce qui s'est passé là-bas (42,30-34 et 43,3-5.7). Arrivés à nouveau chez Joseph, ils parlent longuement à son majordome de l'argent retrouvé dans les sacs, évoquant en détail sa découverte (40,20-23; voir aussi 43,8). Plus loin, Juda adresse à Joseph une longue supplique où il revient sur le passé de la famille, permettant ainsi le dénouement de la crise (44,18-34). La fonction que ces retours en arrière remplissent dans l'économie narrative est de montrer que le retour sur le passé est un détour obligé pour la guérison des maux qui empoisonnent le présent, une guérison qui seule ouvre à la vie un avenir (50,20-21). Et c'est seulement lorsque ce retour au passé a porté ses fruits qu'il est possible d'aller de l'avant. Aussi, lors du second retour des frères chez Jacob, le narrateur pourra se contenter de résumer brièvement leur rapport en n'en rapportant que l'essentiel, à savoir que Joseph est en vie et qu'il est maître au pays d'Égypte (45,26-27).

(b) Le modèle du genre, c'est bien sûr le discours que Juda adresse à Joseph au moment le plus dramatique du récit, en 44,18-34. Ce discours est articulé autour d'une dynamique temporelle très ferme qui

⁽⁵⁰⁾ Pour une comparaison précise entre ces deux récits (parallèles et inversions), voir Y. ZAKOVITCH, «Through the Looking Glass: Reflections/Inversions of Genesis Stories in the Bible», *Biblical Interpretation* 1 (1993) 139-152, surtout p. 141-143. Le parallèle est signalé également par STERNBERG, *The Poetics*, 304, et R. ALTER, *The Art*, 173.

⁽⁵¹⁾ D'autres personnages opèrent des retours en arrière à l'intérieur d'épisodes définis; ils sont donc moins significatifs au plan temporel. La femme de Putiphar «raconte» deux fois ce qui s'est passé lorsqu'elle a entrepris Joseph (39,13-19). De même, en 41,9-13, l'échanson évoque des faits que le narrateur vient de raconter en détail (cf. 40,5-23).

constitue le cœur même de l'argumentation déployée par Juda. Meir Sternberg a analysé avec finesse la manière dont il arrive à exprimer sa supplique pour qu'elle soit à la fois convaincante et émouvante⁽⁵²⁾. En réalité, son discours est répétitif à l'extrême, non seulement parce qu'il y reprend des éléments de récit que le narrateur a déjà exposés, mais surtout parce qu'il revient par trois fois sur un même fait: l'amour privilégié de Jacob pour les fils de Rachel, pour Benjamin en particulier, lien si vital que sa rupture causerait sa mort⁽⁵³⁾.

Autour de ce thème essentiel, Juda revisite le passé récent et envisage le futur proche en trois étapes. [1] Lors de leur première rencontre, les frères ont parlé à Joseph de leur père et du benjamin de la famille, resté seul depuis la disparition de son frère. Ensuite Juda — dans une analepse où il comble une ellipse laissée par le narrateur, si du moins il n'arrange pas la réalité de manière à impliquer davantage Joseph —, Juda précise que, quand le maître égyptien a demandé à voir ce jeune homme, ils l'ont averti que, s'il laissait son père, celui-ci mourrait. Malgré cela, le maître a maintenu son exigence (vv. 19-23). [2] Rentrés chez le père, les frères lui ont fait part de l'exigence de l'Égyptien, et leur père leur a confié leur jeune frère en insistant sur son caractère unique depuis la disparition de son frère Joseph; il a précisé que s'il lui arrivait malheur, ses fils seraient responsables de sa mort (vv. 24-29). [3] Enfin, Juda envisage la perspective qui les attend, maintenant (ועתה) que Benjamin est condamné à rester esclave en Égypte: en rentrant chez leur père sans leur frère, ils provoqueront chez lui une affliction telle qu'ils le précipiteront dans la mort (vv. 30-31).

À ce point, Juda opère un dernier *flash back*, tout en se singularisant, pour la première fois dans son discours, par rapport au reste des frères: il rappelle qu'il s'est porté garant de son frère, s'engageant à le ramener à son père. C'est pourquoi, maintenant (ועתה), il supplie l'Égyptien de le garder comme esclave et de laisser le jeune homme rentrer chez son père (vv. 32-33), car il ne supporterait pas de voir le malheur frapper son père — un cri du cœur qui lui fait oublier le langage de cérémonie qu'il utilisait jusque là (v. 34)⁽⁵⁴⁾. Ce qui ressort de ces derniers mots, c'est que l'offre de Juda n'est plus

⁽⁵²⁾ STERNBERG, *The Poetics*, 307-308. Sur le caractère émotionnel du discours, voir le jugement de SARNA, *Genesis*, 306.

⁽⁵³⁾ Ainsi déjà VON RAD, *Das erste Buch Mose*, 345.

⁽⁵⁴⁾ Sur ce point, voir WESTERMANN, *Genesis 37-50*, 149-150; STERNBERG, *The Poetics*, 308, ou encore WENHAM, *Genesis 16-50*, 426.

motivée par son engagement et son sens des responsabilités, mais plutôt par l'amour pour Jacob, par la pitié pour ce vieux père que ce nouveau malheur n'épargnerait pas. Car sa proposition, bien qu'elle vise le présent immédiat, ramène néanmoins Juda vingt-et-un ans en arrière, lorsqu'au retour de Dotan, il a vu son père déchiré par le chagrin suite à la perte de Joseph. Or, à cette époque, Juda s'était déjà mis à part de ses frères pour leur proposer de vendre leur frère à des marchands descendant en Égypte, le condamnant ainsi vraisemblablement à être esclave dans ce pays. C'est ainsi le coupable qui s'offre pour recevoir le châtiment de sa faute, en subissant le sort qu'il a préparé autrefois pour sa victime, de sorte que le mal qu'il a un jour enclenché cesse de faire de nouvelles victimes⁽⁵⁵⁾.

Sur la base de cette rapide lecture, que peut-on dire de l'effet de ces retours en arrière qui constituent le cœur du discours de Juda? Au fond, ce que ces reprises du passé donnent à voir, c'est le chemin parcouru par Juda et par ses frères, au nom desquels il parle en «nous» quasi jusqu'au terme du discours⁽⁵⁶⁾. Car son discours est une longue anamnèse concernant la relation entre Jacob et ses fils au sujet du fils de Rachel. Lui, Juda, le fils de la femme haïe (cf. 29,30-31), le frère moins aimé (37,3-4), non seulement évoque longuement la préférence de Jacob pour Rachel et ses fils, mais il montre encore qu'il l'admet comme un fait auquel il consent positivement et qui l'émeut, même. Plus encore, il va jusqu'à s'offrir à la place du jeune homme pour que puisse se prolonger cette relation préférentielle dont dépend la vie de son père, et pour que reste libre ce frère plus aimé que lui. Ainsi, ce qui se dévoile dans le rappel de la cause du drame qui a déchiré la famille, c'est que sont désormais guéries l'envie et la jalousie qui ont engendré chez les frères la haine et la violence contre Joseph. Désormais — et leur affection pour leur père tout comme leur solidarité avec Benjamin le montrent — ils sont devenus des fils et des frères.

(c) En ce sens, les retours en arrière de ce texte servent essentiellement à mettre en évidence la *sanatio in radice* que les événements des derniers mois ont opéré chez les frères. Mais il faut ajouter que, à l'horizon de cette scène poignante, un autre moment du

⁽⁵⁵⁾ Voir l'analyse brève mais suggestive de ALTER, *The Art*, 174-175.

⁽⁵⁶⁾ Ainsi STERNBERG, *The Poetics*, 308. C'est seulement dans la dernière partie du discours, lorsqu'il parle de son engagement vis-à-vis de Jacob, que Juda s'exprime au singulier. Selon R. ALTER, *Genesis*. Translation and Commentary (New York – London 1996) 265, Juda parle en tant que «spokesman for the brothers».

passé peut revenir à la mémoire, bien qu'il ne soit évoqué directement ni par Juda ni par le narrateur. Le porte-parole des frères, Juda, est un homme qui connaît de l'intérieur les sentiments d'un père qui, comme Jacob, a vu disparaître deux fils et risque de perdre «l'unique» qui lui reste. Lorsqu'il devait donner Shéla à Tamar, Juda n'a-t-il pas eu peur? N'a-t-il pas refusé d'exposer le dernier de ses fils à un risque qu'il pensait mortel (38,11.14b)? Sur cette base, le lecteur comprend mieux le comportement de Juda vis-à-vis de son père⁽⁵⁷⁾. Du reste, cette aventure avec Tamar lui a aussi enseigné qu'un coupable qui fait la vérité pour épargner à un innocent le malheur qu'il risque de lui infliger, permet au bien et à la vie de traverser le mal qu'il a fait⁽⁵⁸⁾. N'est-ce pas là ce qu'il fait à présent devant ce maître dont il ignore encore qu'il est son frère?

Ce rappel discret induit, à mon sens, que ce que Joseph a fait vivre aux frères de leur passé n'est pas le seul facteur de leur l'avancée vers la fraternité: c'est aussi ce que le temps a apporté à chacun — en particulier à Juda — comme expérience de vie et de maturation personnelle. N'a-t-il pas fallu du temps, et la longue maturation qu'il a permise, pour que Joseph soit capable de dire lors de la naissance de Manassé: «Dieu m'a fait oublier toute ma peine et la maison de mon père» (41,51b)? Or ce nom, loin de consacrer un oubli, comme Joseph semble le dire, garde plutôt le souvenir de blessures dont le traumatisme a cessé de lui faire mal lorsque, le temps et les circonstances aidant, la vie a pu reprendre le dessus⁽⁵⁹⁾.

*
* * *

On le voit: non seulement le narrateur de l'HJ élabore un récit où le traitement du temps balise savamment pour le lecteur les voies de la compréhension de l'intrigue en sa profondeur humaine. Non

⁽⁵⁷⁾ Sur ce point voir la belle analyse de STERNBERG, «Time and Space», 130-132: «confronted with Jacob's outcry that two of his sons are 'gone' and he will not expose his youngest (Benjamin) to the same fate by surrendering him to dangerous relatives, how can Judah fail to identify the reenactment of his own unwillingness to deliver his own youngest son (Shela) into Tamar's arms, where the two older brothers have found their death? Family history repeats itself once more before Judah's eyes, with the tables again ironically turned on him» (p. 131). En ce sens aussi FISCHER, «Josefsgeschichte», 260.

⁽⁵⁸⁾ J'argumente cette lecture ailleurs: A. WÉNIN, «La ruse de Tamar (Gn 38). Une approche narrative», *ScEs* 51 (1999) 265-283, voir p. 276-282.

⁽⁵⁹⁾ Voir aussi à ce sujet les considérations de VON RAD, *Das erste Buch Mose*, 331-332.

seulement il sollicite toute l'acuité de son lecteur en lui proposant l'énigme du statut et de la réalisation complexe des rêves de Joseph. Il compose encore un récit qui illustre comment, pour les personnages eux-mêmes, le travail sur le temps qui s'effectue dans le récit du passé est essentiel pour la vie. Car le récit — véhicule de la mémoire — s'avère dans l'HJ comme le lieu par excellence où les personnages progressent vraiment dans leur quête du *shalom*, du «bien être», quête qui passe par la réconciliation avec le passé. Et celle-ci est la condition de la construction de la fraternité véritable qui elle-même garantit l'accès au pain, à la vie. Ainsi, discrètement, tout en développant son superbe récit, le narrateur fait comprendre au lecteur que le récit — qui assume et travaille la temporalité humaine — est essentiel à la vie.

Université catholique de Louvain
Grand-Place 45
B-1348 Louvain-la-Neuve

André WÉNIN

SUMMARY

This study of the time element in the story of Joseph goes through three stages. (1) Observation of the general temporal structure, the dyschronies (38; 46,8-27) and the detailed structure surrounding the central act (41,53-57 and 47,13-26) goes on to clarify the link between time as given by the narrator and time in the story itself. (2) Attention is then given to the prolepses and other forms of anticipation, among which are Joseph's dreams, about which we enquire to what extent, if any, they lead up to what comes later, and the oracle given at Beer-sheba that announces the final act. (3) Lastly, among the flashbacks, some analepses are studied — the late mention of the interpreter in 42,24, Joseph's distress, related in 42,21-22, and Jacob's final words for the brethren in 50,16-17 — but also the retrospective glances cast by some of the characters on past history, especially Judah's words to Joseph in 44,18-34. These flashbacks bring out the formation of the brotherhood which the story recounts. The story of Joseph thus appears as a story showing how the healing and humanization of human relations are achieved by telling the story of a life.

Aspekte Biblischer Theologie dargestellt an der Verwendung von Ps 16 in Apostelgeschichte 2 und 13⁽¹⁾

Im folgenden Aufsatz werden mit Hilfe von Apg 2 und 13 in ihrer Rezeption von Ps 16 Schwerpunkte gesetzt, die in der Frage um “Biblische Theologie” nicht genügend bedacht worden sind.

Zunächst wird im Abschnitt I an der Aufnahme von Ps 16 durch Apg 2 und 13 gezeigt, daß der hebräische Text gegenüber dem griechischen nicht zu vernachlässigen ist. Im Abschnitt II wird mit Blick auf die Rezeption biblischer Texte grundsätzlich zur Rezeption von Texten Stellung genommen. Es folgt in Abschnitt III ein Blick auf Textrezeption durch Gruppen. Abschnitt IV betont, daß Autoren des Alten und Neuen Testaments das Handeln Gottes in vielfältigen geschichtlichen Situationen bekennen. Darum können Texte beider Testamente in vielfältigen geschichtlichen Situationen ihre Bedeutsamkeit erschließen. Im Abschnitt V wird dargelegt, daß die Frage nach dem Verhältnis von Altem und Neuem Testament in die Christologie gehört.

I. Ps 16 in der Apostelgeschichte 2 und 13: Septuaginta oder hebräischer Text

Die Septuaginta setzt in ihrer Übersetzung des Psalms andere Akzente als der hebräische Text. Sie spricht nicht wie der hebräische Text von “zelten in Hoffnung”, sondern von “wohnen in Sicherheit”; sie sagt nicht, daß der Fromme “das Grab” nicht sieht — sondern, daß er “die Verwesung” nicht sieht. Lukas greift diesen Text der Septuaginta auf. Aus diesem Grund wird in Kommentaren, so z. B. von Haenchen und auch in dem aus neuerer Zeit von Zmijewski gesagt⁽²⁾, daß Lukas die Verbindung zwischen Ps 16 und der Auf-

⁽¹⁾ Dieser Aufsatz ist aus einem um Anmerkungen erweiterten Vortrag hervorgegangen, der auf der Fachgruppentagung neutestamentlicher Exegeten der Wissenschaftlichen Gesellschaft für Theologie am 17.6.2000 in Berlin gehalten wurde.

⁽²⁾ E. HAENCHEN, *Die Apostelgeschichte* (KEK 3; Göttingen 1977) z. St.; E. ZMIJEWSKI, *Die Apostelgeschichte* (RNT; Regensburg 1944) z. St.

erstehung Jesu nur herstellen konnte, weil die Septuaginta gegenüber dem hebräischen Text neue Akzente gesetzt hat, d. h. von "Verwesung" statt von "Grab" spricht. Läßt sich diese Aussage bestätigen?

In der so genannten Pfingstpredigt des Petrus (Apg 2) wird Ps 16 zitiert, um zu belegen, daß Jesus nicht verwest ist (Apg 2,25-28). Daran schließt sich eine Auslegung an, in der es heißt: "Ihr Männer, Brüder, laßt mich freimütig zu euch reden von dem Erzvater David. Er ist gestorben und begraben und *sein Grab* ist bei uns bis auf diesen Tag" (V. 29). Und es folgt eine Neuzusammenstellung von Worten des Psalms: "Er ist nicht dem Hades überlassen, und sein Leib hat *die Verwesung* nicht gesehen" (V. 31).

Stimmt die oben genannte These, daß der Psalm nur verwendet werden konnte, um die Auferstehung Jesu zu belegen, weil er von Lukas der Septuaginta entnommen wurde? Wohl kaum. Das wird daran deutlich, daß die dem Psalmzitat angeschlossene Auslegung in V. 29 nicht von der Verwesung spricht, sondern vom Grab, in Aufnahme des hebräischen Textes. Von der Verwesung wird nur noch einmal im wiederholten, leicht veränderten Zitat V. 31 gesprochen. Das heißt, daß die Tradition des Lukas den hebräischen Text verwendet hatte. Erst Lukas hat den Aspekt der "Verwesung" hineingebracht, weil er für seine griechisch-sprechenden Adressaten die Septuaginta zitierte⁽³⁾.

Eine Unsicherheit dieser Darlegung besteht darin, daß der Hinweis auf das Grab nicht unbedingt vom Psalm abhängig sein muß, sondern adressatenorientiert wirklich auf eine bekannte Tatsache anspielen kann (so nennen Kommentare überwiegend die lokale Grab David Tradition). Wenn dem so sein sollte, dann weist das ebenso auf eine vorlukanische Jerusalemtradition hin. Die Wahrscheinlichkeit, daß auch dann der hebräische Text die Grundlage geboten hat, wäre groß. Mir scheint, daß eher eine nachweisbare Abhängigkeit von der alttestamentlichen Überlieferung vorliegt, als die doch zufallsbedingte Adressatenorientierung. Vor allem stellt sich die Frage, warum Lukas, der ja nicht die Jerusalemer anspricht, diesen Hinweis aufgenommen, gar selbst formuliert haben

⁽³⁾ Laut H.W. BOERS, "Psalm 16 and the historical origin of the Christian faith", ZNW 60 (1969) 105-110, wurde der Psalm schon von Juden messianisch ausgelegt — in dem Sinne, daß er gegen Jesus verwendet wurde: Jesus ist gestorben, aber, wie der Psalm zeigt, der Messias stirbt nicht.

sollte. Es liegt also nicht einmal Adressatenorientierung im engeren Sinn vor. An dieser Stelle hätte, weiterhin vom Kontext aus gesehen, nicht vom Grab gesprochen werden müssen (wie Apg 13 zeigt, s. u.), da ja die "Verwesung" bzw. die "Nichtverwesung" das Thema ist und nicht ein leeres Grab. Es hätte genügt zu sagen: er ist gestorben und wurde begraben ... — der weitere Text ist also überschüssig⁽⁴⁾. Das Ergebnis wird durch Apg 13,30-37 bestätigt. In dieser Rede erscheint nicht das Wort "Grab", sondern nur das Wort, das aus der Septuaginta bekannt war, die "Verwesung". Das zeigt, daß hier Lukas selbst aus dem Septuagintazitat diese Schlußfolgerung gezogen hat. Lukas lehnt sich somit, anders als Apg 2, nicht an eine Tradition an, die den hebräischen Text vorliegen hatte, sondern formuliert diesen Text selbst, angelehnt an Apg 2⁽⁵⁾. Damit ist die oben genannte Aussage, daß der Text des Psalmes nur auf Jesus bezogen werden konnte, weil das Septuagintazitat vorgelegen habe, nicht zu bestätigen⁽⁶⁾.

Dieses Ergebnis ist für die Frage der Biblischen Theologie nicht unwichtig. Denn unter anderem wird aus Beobachtungen, wie der soeben widerlegten These, geschlossen, daß die Septuaginta der eigentliche christliche Bibeltext sei und nicht der hebräische⁽⁷⁾.

⁽⁴⁾ Kommentare gehen nicht auf diese Fragestellung ein, ebenso U. WILCKENS, *Die Missionsreden der Apostelgeschichte*. Form- und traditionsge-schichtliche Untersuchungen (WMANT 5; Neukirchen-Vluyn 1994) nicht. Audeunt C.K. BARRETT, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Acts of the Apostels* (ICC; Edinburgh 1994) I, 147 (ΓΓΩ – διαφθορά), aber er läßt diese Frage offen.

⁽⁵⁾ Seit M. DIBELIUS, *Aufsätze zur Apostelgeschichte* (FRLANT 42; Göttingen 1961) 157, wurde die Ansicht geäußert, daß Lukas allein der Verfasser der Reden sei. Während Dibelius noch ein aufgegriffenes Predigtschema erkennt, sehen WILCKENS, *Missionsreden*, und E. PLÜMACHER, *Lukas als hellenistischer Schriftsteller*. Studien zur Apostelgeschichte (StUNT 9; Göttingen 1972) 79 pass., auch hierin keine nachweisbare Abhängigkeit. Dieser Text zeigt jedoch, daß Lukas an dieser Stelle traditionelle Vorgaben übernommen hat. Deutlicher läßt sich die Aufnahme von Tradition Apg 19,23-40 nachweisen. Der Nachweis muß einer späteren Veröffentlichung vorbehalten bleiben.

⁽⁶⁾ Ein ähnliches Ergebnis zeigt Apk 15,3. Dazu s. W. FENSKE, "Das Lied des Mose, des Knechtes Gottes, und das Lied des Lammes (Apokalypse des Johannes 15,3-4.). Der Text und seine Bedeutung für die Johannes-Apokalypse", ZNW 90 (1999) 250-264. Vgl. R. PESCH, *Die Apostelgeschichte* (EKK 5.1; Neukirchen-Vluyn – Zürich 1986), I, 117-118, zu Apg 2.

⁽⁷⁾ Klassisch: H. GESE, "Erwägungen zur Einheit der biblischen Theologie" (1970); ders., *Vom Sinai zum Zion*. Alttestamentliche Beiträge zur biblischen

Begründet wird das damit, daß neutestamentliche Autoren weitgehend die Septuaginta zitieren und dieser ihre spezifisch christliche Beweisführung entnehmen⁽⁸⁾. Unser Beispiel zeigt, daß der neutestamentliche Autor eine Tradition aufgegriffen hat, die auf dem hebräischen Text basiert. Eine eindeutige Abhängigkeit der frühen Christen von der Septuaginta liegt hier nicht vor — und das in einem wichtigen Zusammenhang: Im Kontext der Auferstehung Jesu.

Es sind also der hebräische Text und die Septuaginta zu berücksichtigen. Schon Augustinus hat *De civitate Dei* 18,42-44 auf die Spannung zwischen der Septuaginta und dem hebräischen Kanon mit der Formel von der Vielfalt in der einen Bibel geantwortet⁽⁹⁾.

Theologie (München 31990) 16-17, aufgegriffen von M. HENGEL – R. DEINES, “Die Septuaginta als ‘christliche Schriftensammlung’ und das Problem des Kanons”, *Verbindliches Zeugnis*. I. Kanon – Schrift – Tradition (Hrsg. W. PANNENBERG – T. SCHNEIDER) (Freiburg – Göttingen 1992) 53. H. HÜBNER, *Biblische Theologie des Neuen Testaments* (Göttingen 1990), I (aber für ihn ist “die Septuaginta weder quantitativ noch theologisch qualitativ identisch mit der *Septuaginta in Novo Testamento recepta*” [66]); P. STUHLMACHER, *Biblische Theologie des Neuen Testaments* (Göttingen 1992), I, 8; (Ders., “Der Kanon und seine Auslegung”, *Jesus Christus die Mitte der Schrift*. Studien zur Hermeneutik des Evangeliums [Hrsg. C. LANDMESSER u.a.] [BZNW 86; Berlin – New York 1997] 276, ist vorsichtiger: “die Septuaginta ist... gebührend zu beachten”); ebenso die Aufsätze von M. MÜLLER, “Die Septuaginta als die Bibel der neutestamentlichen Kirche”, *KuD* 42 (1996) 65-78; M. SECKLER, “Über die Problematik des biblischen Kanons und die Bedeutung seiner Wiederentdeckung”, *ThQ* 180 (2000) 30-53. Für Priorität des hebräischen Textes tritt B.S. CHILDS, *Die Theologie der einen Bibel* (Freiburg 1994-1996), I-II, dadurch ein, daß er in seinen Schriften den hebräischen Text als Endtext des Kanons betont.

⁽⁸⁾ Nach H. HÜBNER, “Vetus Testamentum und Vetus Testamentum in Novo receptum. Die Frage nach dem Kanon des Alten Testaments aus neutestamentlicher Sicht”, *JBTh* 3 (1988) 144, 155, ist die Septuaginta für neutestamentliche Autoren die “weitesthin” autoritative heilige Schrift. Diese Aussage läßt sich jedoch nicht mit der Zitierung der Septuaginta begründen, da eine Zitierung von den griechischsprechenden Adressaten abhängig ist. Somit findet sich in dieser Aussage Hübners eine spätere Diskussion wieder, die bei neutestamentlichen Autoren *expressis verbis* nicht nachweisbar ist.

⁽⁹⁾ Dazu s. auch R. HENNINGS, *Der Briefwechsel zwischen Augustinus und Hieronymus und ihr Streit um den Kanon des Alten Testaments und die Auslegung von Gal 2,11-14* (VigChr.Suppl. 21; Leiden 1993) bes. 43.

II. Wechselseitige Beeinflussung Lesender durch alttestamentliche wie neutestamentliche Texte

Die Verbindung beider Testamente wird heute vorausgesetzt und so wird gefragt: Wird das Alte Testament im Licht des Neuen oder das Neue im Licht des Alten⁽¹⁰⁾ gelesen⁽¹¹⁾?

Wir haben damit Vorstellungen vorliegen, die von einer Art linearen Lesens ausgehen, d. h. entweder wird betont, daß das Alte Testament zeitlich vor dem Neuen da war — oder andersherum: Christen glauben aufgrund neutestamentlicher Verkündigung und lesen von dieser Perspektive aus das Alte Testament.

Aus der Perspektive der Rezeption ist der Sachverhalt anders zu beurteilen. Es ist vielmehr so, daß ein Mensch einen Text liest — ihn aber aus seiner Lebenssituation heraus liest — und somit diese in den Text hineinliest. Gleichzeitig spricht der Text in die Lebenssituation der Lesenden. Mit Blick auf unser Thema gesagt: Christen lesen das Alte Testament aus ihrem Glauben heraus — doch gleichzeitig beeinflußt das Alte Testament den Glauben. Und alles beginnt wieder von vorne: Aus diesem durch das Alte Testament veränderten Glauben heraus lesen Glaubende das Alte Testament und werden wiederum von diesem beeinflußt. Es handelt sich also um eine Art Lesen mit einander fortschreitender Beeinflussung.

Dohmen bietet einen Ansatz solchen Lesens, wenn er sagt, die Bibel sei vom Alten zum Neuen Testament hin zu lesen, doch dann vom Neuen Testament aus⁽¹²⁾. Damit will er die Verbindung zwischen Altem und Neuem Testament aufrecht erhalten, gleichzeitig will er das Alte Testament in seinen ursprünglichen Aussagen würdigen,

⁽¹⁰⁾ S. z. B. E.E. ELLIS, *The Old Testament in Early Christianity. Canon and Interpretation in the Light of Modern Research* (WUNT 54; Tübingen 1991) 50; H.D. PREUB, *Das Alte Testament in christlicher Predigt* (Stuttgart 1984) 21; CHILDS, *Theologie*, I, 111-112; A.J.H. GUNNEWEG, *Biblische Theologie des Alten Testaments. Eine Religionsgeschichte Israels in biblisch theologischer Sicht* (Stuttgart u.a. 1993) 35-36; J. BECKER, "Christologische Deutung des Alten Testaments", *Eine Bibel – zwei Testamente. Positionen Biblischer Theologie* (Hrsg. C. DOHMEN – T. SÖDING) (UTB 1893; Paderborn 1995) 17-28.

⁽¹¹⁾ Diese Frage stellt E. ZENGER, "Thesen zu einer Hermeneutik des Ersten Testaments nach Auschwitz", *Eine Bibel – zwei Testamente. Positionen Biblischer Theologie* (Hrsg. C. DOHMEN – T. SÖDING) (UTB 1893; Paderborn 1995) 148, mit H. VON CAMPENHAUSEN, *Die Entstehung der christlichen Bibel* (BHT 39; Tübingen 1977) 78.

⁽¹²⁾ C. DOHMEN, *Vom Umgang mit dem Alten Testament* (NSK.AT 27; Stuttgart 1995) 98-106.

unabhängig vom christlichen Einlesen. Ein solches unbeeinflusstes Lesen gibt es nicht⁽¹³⁾. Ein intensiver Bezug beider Testamente ist bei Preuß und Zenger zu erkennen. Während Preuß auf die dialektische Spannung hinweist⁽¹⁴⁾, spricht Zenger von "Hermeneutik der kanonischen Dialogizität"⁽¹⁵⁾, d. h. beide Texte sind zunächst unabhängig voneinander zu lesen. Der Streit beider Testamente führt zu einer produktiven Lektüre⁽¹⁶⁾.

Das bedeutet auf Apg 2 bezogen, daß die Erfahrung der Auferstehung Jesu Christi und die Worte des Psalmes einander beeinflussen. Daß es Auferstehung gibt, intendiert für frühe Judenchristen der Psalm. Daß Jesus auferstanden ist, zeigt die Erfahrung der Glaubenden, die mit Hilfe des Psalmes ausgesprochen wird. Der Psalm zeigt ihnen darüber hinaus, daß Jesus Christus nicht allein als von Gott Auferweckter im Glauben erfahren wurde, sondern daß er auch nachweisbar nicht im Grab geblieben bzw. — dann in Weiterführung — nicht verwest ist⁽¹⁷⁾.

Wenn diese Rezeptionsweise beachtet wird, kann kaum mehr gesagt werden, daß neutestamentliche Autoren nur das in das Alte Testament hineinlesen, was sie schon immer wissen⁽¹⁸⁾. Denn Texte bringen sich auch selbst ein⁽¹⁹⁾. In der Rezeption bedingen Altes wie

⁽¹³⁾ Selbst bei Schleiermacher, der dem Alten Testament distanziert gegenüberstand, meldete sich dasselbe in seinen letzten Predigten wieder zurück (vgl. R. SMEND, "Schleiermachers Kritik am Alten Testament", ders., *Epochen der Bibelkritik*. Gesammelte Studien 3 [München 1991] 128-144).

⁽¹⁴⁾ PREÜß, *Predigt*, 35.39.

⁽¹⁵⁾ ZENGER, "Thesen", 153-154.

⁽¹⁶⁾ Vgl. K. KOCH, "Rezeptionsgeschichte als notwendige Voraussetzung einer Biblischen Theologie — oder: Protestantische Verlegenheit angesichts der Geschichte des Kanons", *Sola Scriptura*. Das protestantische Schriftprinzip in der säkularen Welt (Hrsg. H.H. SCHMID – J. MEHLHAUSEN) (Gütersloh 1991) 143-155. Dagegen lehrt M. GÖRG, *In Abrahams Schoß*. Christentum ohne Neues Testament (Düsseldorf 1993), das Alte Testament ohne das Neue Testament zu lesen.

⁽¹⁷⁾ Daß der alttestamentliche Text neu interpretiert wird, zeigt nicht despektierlichen Umgang, im Gegenteil: Er ist so wichtig, daß er als Begründung herangezogen wird; es handelt sich nicht um eine Herabsetzung des Alten Testamentes.

⁽¹⁸⁾ So klassisch R. BULTMANN, "Weissagung und Erfüllung", ders., *Glauben und Verstehen*. Gesammelte Aufsätze (Tübingen 1968) II, 162-186.

⁽¹⁹⁾ Das bedeutet nicht, daß sich Texte mit ihrem ursprünglichen Sinn einbringen müssen. Es geht nur um den interpretierten Sinn. Nicht ohne Grund wird diskutiert, wieweit der Text sich einbringt oder Willkür durch Interpretieren ausgeliefert ist, s. U. ECO, *Zwischen Autor und Text*. Interpretation und Überinterpretation (München 1994); U. ECO, *Lector in fabula*. Die Mitarbeit der Interpretation in erzählenden Texten (München – Wien 1994).

Neues Testament einander. Es gibt keine Einbahnstraße⁽²⁰⁾. Es findet ein reger Austausch statt — trotz Fokussierungen und massiver Eingriffe durch Rezipienten⁽²¹⁾.

III. Gruppenrezeption und Gruppenidentität

Die Erfahrung der Auferweckung Jesu zwang die Gruppe früher Christen, Ps 16 in der soeben dargelegten Weise auszulegen. Auch dieser Psalm wurde von Repräsentanten unterschiedlicher Gruppen weiterentwickelt und interpretiert⁽²²⁾. Auch hier ist somit von „integrativem Lesen“ zu reden, d. h. Situationen, Zeiten u. s. w. lassen Texte jeweils anders verstehen. Und so legen sich neue Gruppenansichten immer über das Alte. Alte Stimmen werden leiser. Nun kann man darüber klagen, daß das Neue Testament das Alte im Grunde kaum mehr richtig sprechen läßt, d. h., daß der christliche Glaube die Stimme des Alten Testaments übertönt. Doch finden wir diesen Sachverhalt, wie an den Interpretationsstufen von Ps 16 angedeutet (s. Anm. 22), vielfach schon im Alten Testament⁽²³⁾

⁽²⁰⁾ So auch KOCH, „Rezeptionsgeschichte“, 145-146.

⁽²¹⁾ Von daher ist kaum zu sagen, daß das Christuserignis „trotz vorhandener Kontinuität ... literaturgeschichtlich wie auch theologisch in einem diskontinuierlichen Verhältnis“ zur alttestamentlichen Überlieferung stehe, so G. STRECKER, *Theologie des Neuen Testaments* (Berlin 1996) 9; vgl. auch in paulinischem Kontext 38-39. Es kommt auf die Rezipienten an. Der frühen Gemeinde war wohl keine Diskontinuität deutlich. Diskontinuität ist erst aus einer anderen Perspektive der Welterklärung herauszuarbeiten. Diese ist jedoch nur eine unter vielen.

⁽²²⁾ Ps 16 besteht aus zusammengefügt Gebeten. Eine detaillierte Ausführung sprengt den Rahmen des Aufsatzes. Darum seien nur Anmerkungen gegeben: Der Psalm läßt folgende Schichten erkennen: (a) Gebet der Freude über ein konkretes Erbe (5a/b; 6a/b; 7a; 9a/b); (b) Gebet angesichts von Bedrohung (wohl Krankheit) (1a/b; 7b; 10a/b; 11a). Diese Schichten wurden von einem Sänger zusammengefügt, um seine Kollegen zu kritisieren, die nicht allein Gott verehren. Das Wort „Erbe“ hat er als traditionelles Lockmittel verstanden und spiritualisiert verwendet, um die Kollegen zu Gott zurückzuholen (2a-d; 3a/b; 4a-d); der Text wurde später mit Ps 15 kombiniert und somit aus der Perspektive des Tempels gelesen. Zunächst geht es Ps 15 um richtiges Verhalten gegenüber Menschen und dann Ps 16 gegenüber Gott. Zuletzt wurde er als Psalm Davids historisiert (8a/b; 11b/c; Überschrift). Dann wurde Ps 16 durch die Übersetzung der Septuaginta, wie gesehen, verändert. Neu interpretiert wurde Ps 16 durch die Verbindung von Altem und Neuem Testament.

⁽²³⁾ S. G. VON RAD, *Theologie des Alten Testaments* (Gütersloh 1993) II, 353. Z. B. sei auf die redaktionelle Arbeit in Genesis verwiesen.

selbst⁽²⁴⁾. Die hinter dieser redaktionellen und rezipierenden Arbeit stehenden Gruppen⁽²⁵⁾ verfolgen mit der Aufnahme und der Veränderung der Traditionen ganz bestimmte Interessen⁽²⁶⁾.

Es sind also jeweils Gruppen (z. B. Leviten, frühe Christen), bzw. Einzelne als Repräsentanten einer Gruppe, die Änderungen vornehmen. Es sind Änderungen, die die alten Texte und Traditionen in die neue Zeit hinüberbringen und sie aus diesem Grund für wertvoll erachten. Für diese Gruppen ist es keine Frage, ob die alte Tradition noch zu ihnen gehört oder nicht. Sie gehört, denn sonst hätten sie sich ja nicht in der Tradition dieser Texte gesehen oder sehen können und hätten diese Texte abgestoßen.

Für die jüden- und heidenchristliche Gruppe ist die Einheit der neuen Erfahrung mit Schriften des Alten Testaments, wie wir an Lukas und seiner Tradition sehen können, vorgegeben, und zwar vorgegeben von ihrer Erfahrung mit den alttestamentlichen Schriften. Aus historischer Perspektive ist diese Einheit genauso wenig zu begründen wie abzulehnen. Anders gesagt: Aus einer anderen Zeit, oder von einer anderen Gruppe her betrachtet, können diese Zusammenhänge als irrelevant oder als unbegründet angesehen werden. Aber wenn eine Gruppe dieses nicht so zu sehen vermag, dann sind die Bande eng geknüpft. Und diese Gruppe der Christen, die in unserem Text ihre Erfahrungen mitteilt, sieht in dieser aktuellen Situation der Auferweckung Jesu Christi denselben Gott am Wirken, der auch durch David geredet bzw. durch die Propheten das gegenwärtige Geschehen verheißen hat. Und eben aus dem

⁽²⁴⁾ Vgl. E. HERMS, "Was haben wir an der Bibel? Versuch einer Theologie des christlichen Kanons", *JBTh* 12 (1999) 125.

⁽²⁵⁾ Weil es eine konforme Gemeinde nicht gegeben hat, sei von "Gruppen" gesprochen. Darüber hinaus ist mit dem Wort "Gruppe" eine stärkere gesellschaftspolitische Verflechtung angedeutet. Diese Verflechtung findet in den biblischen Schriften ihren Ausdruck. So läßt z. B. Röm 6,20 durchblicken, daß sich Menschen aus Verdruß an der ethischen Situation ihrer Zeit dem christlichen Glauben zugewandt haben. Zur Definition von "Gruppe" s. H.P. BAHRDT, *Schlüsselbegriffe der Soziologie. Eine Einführung mit Lehrbeispielen* (München 1994) 86-106; R. KLIMA, "Gruppe", *Lexikon zur Soziologie* (Hrsg. W. FUCHS-HEINRITZ u.a.) (Opladen 1994) 255.

⁽²⁶⁾ Darin unterscheiden sich die Ansätze von J.A. SANDERS, "Canonical Context and Canonical Criticism", *HBT* 2 (1980) 173-198 und J.A. SANDERS, *From Sacred Story to Sacred Text. Canon as Paradigm* (Philadelphia 1992) und B.S. CHILDS, *Old Testament Theology in a Canonical Context* (Philadelphia 1986) und CHILDS, *Theologie*, I.

Bekenntnis⁽²⁷⁾ heraus, das Folge dieser Erfahrung ist, ist die Einheit beider Testamente vorgegeben. Man kann sie aus unterschiedlichsten Gründen in Frage stellen, aus Gründen anders orientierten Glaubens, aus Gründen einer bestimmten Logik, aus Ideologie — doch für die Gruppe, die beide Testamente verknüpft, sind alle Gründe dagegen aufgrund ihrer Erfahrung nicht zwingend⁽²⁸⁾.

Die traditionell-christliche Auslegungsweise ist vor allem durch historisch-kritische Exegeten in Frage gestellt worden. In der “Biblischen Theologie” wird nun versucht, diese durch historische Betrachtung auseinandergerissenen Testamente wieder zu verknüpfen. So kann man historisch klingende Begründungen für die Einheit suchen, z. B., daß das Neue Testament ohne das Alte nicht zu verstehen sei — aber auch diese Begründungen sind, wenn nicht alle zeitgenössischen Texte herangezogen werden, eben auch Aussagen des Glaubens — nur mit historisierendem Anschein. Denn das Neue Testament ist ohne alttestamentliche Schriften genauso wenig zu verstehen wie ohne Zuhilfenahme anderer jüdischer, wie in begrenztem Maß hellenistischer, Schriften⁽²⁹⁾. Allerdings werden alttestamentliche Schriften zu Recht hervorgehoben, weil ein großer Teil von ihnen schon in neutestamentlicher Zeit bevorzugt verwendet wurde, womit sie eine größere Wirkung entfalten konnten. Von hier aus gesehen kann das Alte Testament nicht mehr vom Neuen getrennt werden, da die Verknüpfungen durch frühchristliche Autoren geschehen sind⁽³⁰⁾. Eine Trennung würde die Gegenwart von der kirchengeschichtlich wirksamen Auslegung, die das Alte Testament weitgehend berücksichtigt hatte, lösen. Es geht also nicht um die Frage, ob das Alte Testament anerkannt werden solle oder nicht. Die Weichen wurden gestellt. Und so ist Vergewisserung der geschichtlich gewachsenen Identität der Gruppe mit der Anerkennung des Alten Testaments gegeben⁽³¹⁾. Die Verwunderung darüber, daß christliche

⁽²⁷⁾ Vgl. T. SÖDING, *Mehr als ein Buch*. Die Bibel begreifen (Freiburg 1995) 80-81.

⁽²⁸⁾ Vgl. H. RÄISÄNEN, “‘Theologie des Neuen Testaments’ und ihre Alternative heute”, *Das Urchristentum in seiner literarischen Geschichte* (FS. J. Becker; [Hrsg. U. MELL – B. MÜLLER] Berlin – New York 1999) 521.

⁽²⁹⁾ S. G. STRECKER “Biblische Theologie? Kritische Bemerkungen zu den Entwürfen von Hartmut Gese und Peter Stuhlmacher”, *Kirche* (FS. G. Bornkamm; [Hrsg. D. LÜHRMANN – G. STRECKER] Tübingen 1980) 425-445.

⁽³⁰⁾ Vgl. z. B. HÜBNER, *Theologie*, 15.

⁽³¹⁾ Insofern ist es nicht verwunderlich, daß Gruppen, die um eine neue Identität ringen, wie unter anderem in der Zeit des Dritten Reiches Gruppen ihre

Theologen noch das Alte Testament heranziehen⁽³²⁾, ist als Staunen verständlich, aber eine Distanzierung vom Alten Testament ist nicht zu begründen, wenn eine Gruppe ihre historisch gewachsene Identität wahren will⁽³³⁾.

Auch eine Mitte beider Testamente⁽³⁴⁾ ist historisch nicht zu begründen. Sie ist aber aus ekklesiologischen Gründen notwendig. Denn diese Suche der Mitte verlangsamt das Auseinanderdriften der christlichen Gruppen. Allerdings muß diese "Mitte" dann möglichst konkret formuliert sein⁽³⁵⁾.

Nicht erst im Neuen Testament legt eine Gruppe den Text anders aus, als er sich selbst verstanden hat, das geschah schon immer. Und das läßt auch rabbinische Interpretation erkennen. Die Freiheit

Herkunft als Arier betonten, diese kirchengeschichtlich gewachsene Identität kappen wollten.

⁽³²⁾ A. VON HARNACK, *Marcion. Das Evangelium vom fremden Gott* (Leipzig 1924) 217 (vgl. schon F. SCHLEIERMACHER, *Über die Religion. Reden an die Gebildeten unter ihren Verächtern* [Philosophische Bibliothek 255; Hamburg 1960] §132).

⁽³³⁾ O. HOFIUS, "Das apostolische Christuszeugnis und das Alte Testament. Thesen zur Biblischen Theologie", *Eine Bibel – zwei Testamente. Positionen Biblischer Theologie* (Hrsg. C. DOHMEN – T. SÖDING) (UTB 1893; Paderborn 1995) 198, meint: "Das Alte Testament bezeugt Gottes Geschichte mit seinem Volk Israel, die als solche keineswegs die Geschichte aller Menschen und mithin auch nicht 'meine', des Heidenchristen, Geschichte ist". Diese Aussage wird von HERMS, "Bibel", 106, zu recht kritisiert (ein "inakzeptabel enges Verständnis des Ausdrucks 'meiner Geschichte'"). Vgl. HERMISSON, "Jesus Christus", 223, "daß David ein großes Reich errichtete ... — das alles geht uns als historisches Ereignis nichts mehr an. Aber nun kamen solche Ereignisse als Erfahrungen des Glaubens zur Sprache, wurden zum überlieferbaren und wiederholbaren Text. Erst so erreicht uns vergangene Geschichte, so geht sie uns an".

⁽³⁴⁾ Vgl. z. B. I.U. DALFERTH, "Die Mitte ist außen. Anmerkungen zum Wirklichkeitsverständnis evangelischer Schriftauslegung", *Jesus Christus die Mitte der Schrift. Studien zur Hermeneutik des Evangeliums* (Hrsg. C. LANDMESSER u.a.) (BZNW 86; Berlin – New York 1997) 173-198; R. SMEND, "Die Mitte des Alten Testaments" (1970); ders., *Die Mitte des Alten Testaments* (München 1986) 40-84.

⁽³⁵⁾ H.-J. HERMISSON, "Jesus Christus als externe Mitte des Alten Testaments. Ein unzeitgemäßes Votum zur Theologie des Alten Testaments", *Jesus Christus die Mitte der Schrift. Studien zur Hermeneutik des Evangeliums* (Hrsg. C. LANDMESSER u.a.) (BZNW 86; Berlin – New York 1997) 224, spricht statt von Mitte, von Summe der Theologie, d. h. "Aufgabe der Theologie ist es ... zu fragen ... wo ein theologischer Sachverhalt, ein theologisches Thema seine klarste und abschließende Gestalt bekommen hat. Hier wäre von einer theologischen 'Summe' zu sprechen".

jüdischer Interpretation ist, wie ein Vergleich der Psalmen-Auslegung Luthers mit rabbinischer Interpretation zeigt⁽³⁶⁾, mit christlicher Freiheit gleichzustellen⁽³⁷⁾. Das heißt, daß die Aussage, Rabbinen hätten gegenüber christlichen Exegeten den Vorzug, weil sie in einem Strom mündlicher Überlieferung stehen⁽³⁸⁾, nicht den Gegebenheiten von Rezeption entspricht⁽³⁹⁾, da Rezeption immer von Gruppeninterpretationen in ihrer jeweiligen Zeit abhängig ist⁽⁴⁰⁾.

Die Frage ist also nicht, ob neutestamentliche oder rabbinische Auslegung alttestamentlichen Texten gegenüber angemessen ist, sondern sie lautet: In welchen Gruppen wird die jeweilige Interpretation akzeptiert? Und für die jeweilige Gruppe wird die

⁽³⁶⁾ M. LUTHER, *Psalmen-Auslegung* (WA 31.I; Göttingen 1959) I, 520,24; *The Midrash on Psalms*. Translated from the Hebrew and Aramaic by W.G. Braude (YJS; New Haven 1959).

⁽³⁷⁾ Dazu s. I. KALIMI, "Religionsgeschichte Israels oder Theologie des Alten Testaments? Das jüdische Interesse an der Biblischen Theologie", *JBTh* 10 (1995) 45-68; E. ZENGER, "Heilige Schrift der Juden und Christen", *Einleitung in das Alte Testament* (Hrsg. E. ZENGER u.a.) (Stuttgart u.a. 1995) 12-33. Vgl. Weiterführend den Aufsatzband von M. KLOPFENSTEIN u.a., *Mitte der Schrift?* Ein jüdisch-christliches Gespräch (JudChr 11; Bern 1987).

⁽³⁸⁾ So R. RENDTORFF, "Die Bibel Israels als Buch von Christen", *Eine Bibel – zwei Testamente*. Positionen Biblischer Theologie (Hrsg. C. DOHMEN – T. SÖDING) (UTB 1893; Paderborn 1995) 104. Allerdings kann R. RENDTORFF, "Wege zu einem gemeinsamen jüdisch-christlichen Umgang mit dem Alten Testament", ders., *Kanon und Theologie*. Vorarbeiten zu einer Theologie des Alten Testaments (Neukirchen-Vluyn 1991) 45, auch vom Judentum und Christentum als Nachfolgerreligionen des biblischen Israel sprechen. H. SPIECKERMANN, "Die Verbindlichkeit des Alten Testaments. Unzeitgemäße Betrachtungen zu einem ungeliebten Thema", *JBTh* 12 (1997) 48, sieht die "hermeneutische Ausgangsposition" als "vergleichbar" an. Es handelt sich um "konkurrierende Wahrnehmung", die den "geschwisterlichen Dialog" erfordert. Dazu s. auch U.H.J. KÖRTNER, "Volk Gottes – Kirche – Israel", *ZThK* 91 (1994) 51-79.

⁽³⁹⁾ Daß wir mit Judentum und Christentum einen "doppelten Ausgang des Alten Testaments" (K. KOCH, "Der doppelte Ausgang des Alten Testaments in Judentum und Christentum", *JBTh* 1 [1986] 216-242) oder zwei "Nachfolgerreligionen" (Rendtorff) haben und damit "von einer nicht mehr auflösbaren hermeneutischen Alternative auszugehen ist" (SECKLER, "Problematik", 43), ist nicht das letzte Wort. Wie zu sehen sein wird, besteht die Spannung in der Christologie, zum anderen ist für Juden und Christen gleichermaßen aufgegeben, das in den Schriften niedergelegte Bekenntnis zum Handeln Gottes aufzugreifen.

⁽⁴⁰⁾ Zur Rezeption biblischer Schriften s. Lk 10,26: Was steht in der Tora? Wie liest *du* es? Daß Gruppen ihren jeweiligen hermeneutischen Schlüssel haben, weiß Paulus 2 Kor 3.

Textvielfalt wie die kanonische Vielfalt zu einer gewissen Einheit, weil sie die vielen Fäden zusammenzuknüpfen vermag. D. h. die kanonische Einheit besteht in einem gewissen Rahmen in der Rezeption durch eine Gruppe. Eine Trennung des Alten Testaments vom Neuen Testament ist jedoch, um es noch einmal zu vertiefen, ohne Schaden nicht mehr möglich. Das darum nicht, weil die frühe Gemeinde nicht allein beide Testamente durch Zitate eng verknüpfte, sondern, wie an der Verflechtung von Erfahrung und Text, Text und Erfahrung gesehen, vom Geist des Alten Testaments lebt.

Neben der genannten Einheit kommt jedoch durch die unterschiedlichen Rezeptionen (durch Individuen oder durch Gruppen) die vielfältige Wirkung zum Zuge, die durch mannigfaltige Erfahrung des Handelns Gottes in geschichtlichen Situationen bedingt ist⁽⁴¹⁾. Diese Vielfalt verbindet alttestamentliche wie neutestamentliche Schriften. Das ist nicht anders zu beurteilen als die Vielfalt, die mit den Übersetzungen gegeben ist, oder die Vielfalt, die mit dem besonderen Charakter der Propheten oder mit den Evangelien gegeben ist.

IV. Handeln Gottes in der jeweiligen geschichtlichen Situation

Lukas sieht Ps 16 in die Pfingstpredigt eingebunden. Und so bekommt der Psalm seine Relevanz auch in der Apostelgeschichte wie Generationen zuvor nicht, weil sich ein Beter einmal über sein Erbe gefreut hat, sondern weil in diesen Worten immer wieder das aktuelle Handeln Gottes in der jeweiligen Zeit, für die jeweilige Gruppe erkannt, hineingelesen und weitergeführt worden ist. Das bedeutet auch von den Erfahrungen des Handelns Gottes aus gesehen: Altes wie Neues Testament hängen zusammen. Aus der Perspektive des Glaubens haben alttestamentliche wie neutestamentliche Texte lebendige Bedeutung für eine große Gruppe von Menschen — und sie harren als Erfahrung des wirkenden Gottes der Realisierung in der Gegenwart. Und so finden wir sowohl in Qumran (4QpPs 37; 4QpHab) als auch im Neuen Testament die Aussage, daß der jeweilige alttestamentliche Text für die Gegenwart geschrieben wurde (vgl. Röm 15). D. h. Gottes Handeln ist für Rezipienten mit den Texten nicht auf

⁽⁴¹⁾ HERMISSON, "Jesus Christus", 226, sieht, daß mit dem Alten Testament gelernt werden muß, "daß der geschichtlichen Wirklichkeit des Menschen vielfach nicht eine, sondern mehrere Antworten angemessen sind".

einen vergangenen Zeitpunkt fixiert, sondern weist mit den Texten in die Zukunft⁽⁴²⁾.

Es handelt sich bei dem Alten wie bei dem Neuen Testament um Texte, die von Offenbarungen Gottes reden bzw. von Erfahrungen, die Menschen in der Geschichte mit Gott gemacht haben⁽⁴³⁾. Die herausgehobene Bedeutung der Texte im Vergleich mit anderen zeitgenössischen Texten ist letztendlich nur mit dem Leben derer, die die Bedeutung der Texte betonen, angemessen zu bestätigen. Dann, wenn der Geltungsanspruch der Texte in der jeweiligen Gegenwart seine Realisierung findet, können andere diesen Geltungsanspruch der Texte ebenfalls akzeptieren⁽⁴⁴⁾. Aufgrund der christlichen Gruppenidentität gehen Glaubende mit dem Geltungsanspruch, der mit der Aussage erhoben wird, daß im Alten wie im Neuen Testament Gottes Handeln bekannt wird, nicht allein die Verpflichtung ein, mit der sozialen Handlung des Diskurses, sondern mit der Konkretion diesen Geltungsanspruch einzulösen⁽⁴⁵⁾. Damit soll nicht ausgeschlossen werden, daß, mit Käsemann gesprochen, auch im biblischen Kanon der Streit zwischen Gott und Abgott im Gange ist und somit einigen Texten energisch widersprochen werden muß⁽⁴⁶⁾.

Das bedeutet, die Einheit Alten und Neuen Testamentes besteht in

⁽⁴²⁾ Vgl. DALFERTH, "Mitte", 179; im Alten Testament ist das dadurch impliziert, daß die Texte in der Gemeinde weiterentwickelt wurden; vgl. W. FENSKE, "Und wenn ihr betet..." (Mt 6,5). Gebete in der zwischenmenschlichen Kommunikation der Antike als Ausdruck der Frömmigkeit (StUNT 21; Göttingen 1997) 185-187.

⁽⁴³⁾ Vgl. H.H. SCHMID, "Unterwegs zu einer neuen Biblischen Theologie? Anfragen an die von H. Gese und P. Stuhlmacher vorgetragene Entwurfe Biblischer Theologie", *Biblische Theologie heute*. Einführung, Beispiele, Kontroversen (Hrsg. K. HAACKER u.a.) (BThSt 1; Neukirchen-Vluyn 1977) 90.

⁽⁴⁴⁾ M.G. BRETT, *Biblical Criticism in Crisis? The impact of the canonical approach on Old Testament Studies* (Cambridge 1991), besteht darauf, daß Exegese nur das Wissenschaftliche bedenken soll und nicht die Offenbarung. Doch geht es mit dem Alten wie dem Neuen Testament um Texte, die von Gottes Handeln in der Geschichte sprechen, und die Aussagen des Textes sind ja letztlich nur "verifizierbar", wenn sie in der Gegenwart Bestätigung finden. Darüber hinaus haben Texte, die von Offenbarung reden, einen besonderen Inhalt. Wenn die geschichtlichen Personen darüber sprechen, werden sie nur ernst genommen, wenn der Inhalt dieser Texte ernstgenommen wird.

⁽⁴⁵⁾ Vgl. SPIECKERMANN, "Verbindlichkeit", 46.

⁽⁴⁶⁾ E. KÄSEMAN, "III. Zusammenfassung", *Das Neue Testament als Kanon*. Dokumentation und kritische Analyse zur gegenwärtigen Diskussion (Hrsg. E. KÄSEMAN) (Göttingen 1970) 407-408.

den Bekenntnissen von Gottes Handeln in der Geschichte⁽⁴⁷⁾ — das in vielfältigen Situationen; und darum können diese Texte ihren Geltungsanspruch durch Rezipienten und Rezipientinnen in ihren vielfältigen geschichtlichen Situationen jeweils immer wieder aktuell durchsetzen. Es werden freilich, wie gesehen, nicht die alttestamentlichen wie neutestamentlichen Texte insgesamt rezipiert und umgesetzt. So werden je nach geschichtlicher Situation zum Beispiel Teile fokussiert.

V. Jesus von Nazareth — Jesus Christus und die Zusammengehörigkeit beider Testamente

Die christliche Gruppe interpretiert diesen Psalm wie Apg 2 zeigt aufgrund der Erfahrung des auferweckten Jesus Christus erst mit der Geistausgießung im christologischen Sinn. Jesus von Nazareth wird die alttestamentlichen Schriften mit seiner jüdischen Tradition rezipiert haben⁽⁴⁸⁾, kurz: Jesus las Ps 16 anders als Lukas⁽⁴⁹⁾. Diese Beobachtung führt dazu, daß die Auseinandersetzung um das Verhältnis zwischen Altem und Neuem Testament in den Glauben an Jesus Christus, der der Jude Jesus von Nazareth ist, hineingehört. Es handelt sich also um eine Frage der Christologie, um eine spezifisch christliche Fragestellung und nicht eine in der Auseinandersetzung mit

⁽⁴⁷⁾ Anders als in diesem Aufsatz, der Gottes Handeln betont, wird im Zusammenhang der Biblischen Theologie Gott selbst in den Blick genommen, s. W.H. SCHMIDT, "Altes Testament", *Theologie im 20. Jahrhundert* (Hrsg. G. STRECKER) (UTB 1238; Tübingen 1983) 53; A.J.H. GUNNEWEG, *Vom Verstehen des Alten Testaments. Eine Hermeneutik* (GAT 5; Göttingen 1977) 186. Vgl. B. JANOWSKI, "Der eine Gott der beiden Testamente. Grundfragen einer Biblischen Theologie", ders., *Beiträge zur Theologie des Alten Testaments. II. Die rettende Gerechtigkeit*. (Neukirchen-Vluyn 1999) 249-284.

⁽⁴⁸⁾ Zur jüdischen Perspektive Jesu s. RENDTORFF, "Bibel", 111-112; N. LOHFINK, *Das Jüdische am Christentum. Die verlorene Dimension* (Freiburg 1989).

⁽⁴⁹⁾ U. MAUSER, "Εἷς Θεός und Μόνος Θεός in Biblischer Theologie", *JBTh* 1 (1986) 71-87 schreibt: im Neuen Testament wurde das Bekenntnis "ein Gott" mit "ein Herr Christus" erweitert. Man kommt "an der Frage nicht vorbei, ob die christologische Erweiterung des Bekenntnisses zum einen Gott des Alten Testaments dieses nicht an entscheidender Stelle so hinter sich läßt, daß von einer Einheit des Gottes beider Testamente nicht die Rede sein kann". Die Rede von einem Christus ersetzt im Neuen Testament nicht die Rede vom einen Gott. Solche Reflexionen, die für die neutestamentlichen Autoren wohl blasphemisch gewesen wären, sind späterer Zeit vorbehalten.

der jüdischen Tradition, die durch das Alte Testament repräsentiert wird⁽⁵⁰⁾.

VI. Fazit

Der Titel dieses Vortrags verspricht Aspekte Biblischer Theologie. Welches Ergebnis kann vorgelegt werden?

1. Die Frage, ob die Septuaginta oder der hebräische Text zu verwenden ist, wurde mit "sowohl — als auch" beantwortet.

2. Die Frage, ob das Alte Testament im Licht des Neuen oder umgekehrt zu lesen sei, wurde mit Hilfe des Rezeptionsansatzes so beantwortet, daß Lesende Texte beeinflussen und Texte Lesende — und das in einer fortschreitenden Beeinflussung.

3. Die Zusammengehörigkeit beider Testamente gilt, wenn eine Gruppe sie aus ihrer Glaubenserfahrung, u. s. w. zusammen sieht. Es gibt keine für alle akzeptablen objektiven Kriterien weder für den Zusammenhalt noch für die Trennung.

4. Von dieser Basis aus wurde die Zusammengehörigkeit dadurch erkannt, daß, wie bekannt wird, in beiden Testamenten ein und derselbe Gott handelt und in der jeweiligen Situation wirksam werden möchte und die Menschen ihre Existenz auf diesen Gott bezogen sehen. Und durch den Hinweis auf Rezeption wurde herausgearbeitet, daß das Handeln Gottes nicht in Texte eingeschlossen werden kann, sondern jeweils in vielen unterschiedlichen geschichtlichen Situationen aktuell werden möchte. Allein so wird der Geltungsanspruch der Texte bestätigt, sind ihre theologischen Aussagen aktuell verifizierbar.

5. Die Frage der spannungsvollen Zusammengehörigkeit beider Testamente wurde zuletzt dahin verwiesen, wo sie für Christen hingehört: in die Christologie.

*
* *

Die Aussage, daß beide Testamente zusammengehören, hängt mit der Identität einer Gruppe zusammen und wird durch Interpretation legitimiert. Sie wird durch einander beeinflussendes und integratives Lesen, durch Fokussierung und nicht zuletzt durch Einlösung des mit

⁽⁵⁰⁾ Trotz Christus ist Gottes Handeln im Neuen Testament wenn auch letztgültig, so doch nur zum Teil beschrieben. Man kann Gottes "Vergangenheit" nicht ausblenden.

den Texten verbundenen Geltungsanspruchs bestätigt. Was hat angesichts dieser Gruppenbetonung und der in diesem Aufsatz scheinbar verteidigten willkürlichen Rezeption noch die historisch-kritische Exegese zu sagen? Sie ist Anwalt der Menschen, die in den Texten ihre Stimmen erheben⁽⁵¹⁾ — somit sehe ich sie auch aufgrund der Vielfalt der Situationen, in denen einzelne Menschen als Boten Gottes sprechen und handeln müssen, als Anwalt für die Pluralität der Theologien. Sie versucht gegen spätere Neuinterpretationen — auch gegen die Interpretation von Apg 2 und 13 — den ursprünglichen Redner hervorzuheben; das auch gegen den alttestamentlichen Endredaktor, denn die Endredaktion war Gott nicht näher als der erste Beter⁽⁵²⁾. Dabei wohl wissend, daß Gottes Handeln für Christen und Juden nicht bei der Erstaussage der Psalmtexte stehengeblieben ist. D. h. alle Gotteserfahrungen müssen ihr Recht behalten, auch wenn sie für Christen von Jesus Christus bestimmt sind⁽⁵³⁾. Sie sind als Erfahrung mit Gott auch für Christen in sich wertvoll und unverzichtbar; das nicht allein, weil sie neutestamentliche Erfahrungen zur Sprache verhelfen, sondern Gotteserfahrungen sind, die Menschen im Leben gemacht haben. Der Rückgriff auf den ursprünglichen Beter zeigt, daß Gott ganz konkret durch Menschen gehört wird, die sich über ihr Erbe freuen, den Tod fürchten, die Zuversicht angesichts der Nähe Gottes aussprechen lernen, die sich mit einem Bekenntnis zu Gott gegen Widergöttliches abgrenzen u. s. w.⁽⁵⁴⁾.

⁽⁵¹⁾ SECKLER, "Problematik", weist der historisch-kritischen Forschung eine ähnliche Aufgabe zu wie dieser Aufsatz, freilich um ihre Bedeutung in der Kanonfrage festzuhalten. In diesem Aufsatz geht es jedoch nicht um eine Ehrenrettung, sondern um eine notwendige Grundlage, denn ohne diese kann den einzelnen Texten wie den Gruppen nicht die ihnen gebührende Beachtung gegeben werden.

⁽⁵²⁾ Vgl. H. HÜBNER, "Ein neuer *textus receptus* und sein Problem. Synchronie als Abwertung der Geschichte?", *Jesus Christus die Mitte der Schrift. Studien zur Hermeneutik des Evangeliums* (Hrsg. C. LANDMESSER u.a.) (BZNW 86; Berlin – New York 1997) 242.

⁽⁵³⁾ Das hat nichts mit dem traditionellen "archaisierenden Offenbarungs- und Inspirationsdenken" zu tun, das SECKLER, "Problematik", herausarbeitet. Andererseits gehe ich mit diesen Aussagen über das hinaus, was J. ASSMANN, *Fünf Stufen auf dem Wege zum Kanon. Tradition und Schriftkultur im frühen Judentum und seiner Umwelt* (Münstersche Theologische Vorträge 1; Münster 1998) 14 erarbeitet: "Die Normativität des Textes, seine Autorität und Hochverbindlichkeit bezieht sich ausschließlich auf diese Endgestalt, nicht auf irgendwelche Vor- und Urstufen".

⁽⁵⁴⁾ Vgl. SÖDING, *Buch*, 73-74.

Das Einbringen des Psalmes in diese wechselseitige Beeinflussung von Altem und Neuem Testament und der jeweiligen Gegenwart führt zur Konkretion des Gottesglaubens⁽⁵⁵⁾. Er dient dann nicht mehr allein der Lehre über die Auferstehung Jesu Christi, sondern die Menschen, die den Psalm beten, sind als Betende in Gottes vielfältigem Handeln involviert. Darüber hinaus bringt die Psalminterpretation durch Apg 2 und 13 Konkretionen in die abstrakte Christologie.

Bahnhofstrasse 21
D-64569 Nauheim

Wolfgang FENSKE

SUMMARY

The author in his study of the appropriation of Ps 16 in Acts 2 brings out various aspects of biblical theology. The Hebrew text was just as important for the development of christological doctrines as was the LXX. The christian appropriation of the texts continues what had always been happening with the texts which are painted over on the basis of a new experience of God's activity in Jewish history. It is the task of exegesis to draw out these steps towards the formulation of a creed, with a view to appreciating God's activity in particular historical situations. In the OT Christians recognize God's activity which is, however, not confined within the OT/NT but is actualized by those who appropriate it. In this way the texts' claim to validity is confirmed and they become verifiable in the present. The question of whether the OT should be understood from the perspective of the NT or vice versa becomes irrelevant, for from the perspective of appropriating texts what counts is that the reading of one text influences the interpretation of another. Christian texts through their appropriation of the OT require adherence to it. The union of OT/NT remains nevertheless fraught with tension. This is not, however, a theme in the relationship of Jews and Christians but belongs to christology.

⁽⁵⁵⁾ Wobei mit N LOHFINK, "Eine Bibel – zwei Testamente", *Eine Bibel – zwei Testamente*. Positionen Biblischer Theologie (Hrsg. C. DOHMEN – T. SÖDING) (UTB 1893; Paderborn 1995) 75, zu recht abzulehnen ist, daß das Alte Testament im Gegensatz zum Neuen stärker an Gesellschaft und Diesseits orientiert sei.

‘With many other words’ (Acts 2,40): Theological Assumptions in Peter’s Pentecost Speech

Having begun at Acts, 2,14b, Peter’s speech at Pentecost ends with Acts 2,36⁽¹⁾. This bevy of verses, Acts 2,14b-36, is self-contained and finds its highpoint in its final verse, the call of Peter to his audience to recognize that God has made Jesus, whom it had rejected, Lord and Messiah of Israel. One notes that, with v. 41, Luke reports the number of conversions to be ‘about three thousand’. Are these conversions to be understood to be the result of just vv. 14b-36?

It seems more reasonable to say that the conversions reported in v. 41 are the result of Peter’s Pentecostal words, together with other statements (one might include those cited in vv. 38-39) and, especially, ‘many other words’ (v. 40). The indication that speaks of ‘many other words’ before the announcement of the large numbers converted makes the reader suspect that the Pentecost speech alone was not conceived by Luke as having, in itself, the power to bring about these many conversions⁽²⁾. But, the speech, expanded and developed⁽³⁾, and joined with other arguments — that would be the matrix of ideas which, under the power of God, would move so many people to conversion.

Thus, one is led to the supposition that the Pentecost speech of Peter is a very good presentation of the truth about Jesus, a representative presentation which at the same time shows the strength of a

⁽¹⁾ That Peter’s speech ends with Acts 2,36 seems apparent; yet arguments are offered that the real ending is Acts 2,38 (the call to repentance and baptism) or Acts 2,40 (the call to be saved). Cf. R. PESCH, *Die Apostelgeschichte* (EKK 5; Zürich 1986) I, 116: ‘Die Pfingstbericht ... umfasst vier durch deutliche Gliederungssignale ... unterschiedene Teile: 1. Die Deutung des Pfingstwunders ... 2. Die Verkündigung der Auferstehung Jesu ... 3. Die Rückführung des Pfingstwunders auf den auferstandenen und erhöhten Messias und Herrn Jesus ... 4. Die Umkehrungsmahnung’. M. DIBELIUS, *Aufsätze zur Apostelgeschichte* (FRLANT 60; Göttingen ³1953) 43-44, in pursuit of a ‘Predigtsmodell’, suggests a speech of 5 parts: *Einleitung*, *kerygma*, *Zeugenschaft der Apostel*, *Schriftbeweis*, *Umkehrmahnung*.

⁽²⁾ Cf. J.R.W. SCOTT, *The Message of Acts: to the Ends of the Earth* (Leicester 1990) 78.

⁽³⁾ F.F. BRUCE, *The Acts of the Apostles*. The Greek with Text, Introduction and Commentary (Grand Rapids ³1980) 120, prefers to ‘a call to repentance’ the speech’s final part.

solid witness to Jesus and offers itself as a typical, though not exhaustive example of the bases of early post-pentecostal successful and convincing preaching. In short, 'many other words' suggests that there are further thoughts in support of the goals of the Pentecostal speech, as well as arguments aimed directly to appeal for conversion⁽⁴⁾. In particular, and of present interest to us is the fact that they also suggest that 'many other words' suggest that indeed some of the major thoughts of the Pentecostal speech itself need further explanation in order to be convincing.

But, also a closer look at the Pentecostal speech itself would suggest that further explanation of at least some of its ideas is called for. Indeed, are there some logical or informational lacunae in the speech which do need addressing before one might be so convinced by Peter's speech as to become a believer in him who one had decided, only 50 days ago, deserved to be put to death? It is this latter thought (re: lacunae) that is pursued in this essay; indeed, I wish to explore certain aspects in the argumentation of the speech Peter gives, including a reference which, as it stands in the speech, is only tantalizing, not satisfying⁽⁵⁾.

I. Luke's Introduction to Peter's Argument

As is usual in Acts discourses, the Pentecost speech fits neatly into its circumstances. In particular, this speech means to respond to the question which gives focus to the experience of the Pentecost crowd: 'What does this mean?' (v. 12)⁽⁶⁾. Not only does the group ask, 'What does this mean?', where the word 'this' refers of course primarily to 'their speaking in our languages the wonders of God' (v. 11), then also to 'this sound' (i.e., 'a noise like a strong, driving wind' (v. 2), but Peter

⁽⁴⁾ B. WITHERINGTON, III, *The Acts of the Apostles*. A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary (Grand Rapids 1998) 139, looks upon vv. 38-39 as the 'peroratio' of the Pentecostal speech.

⁽⁵⁾ I should add that these elements I call attention to in this essay are not meant to form a claim that Luke has erred in the logic of Peter's witness to Jesus. I suspect that the three elements I discuss are to be thought of as elements of what Luke himself speaks of after the speech: 'with many other arguments'; that is to say that the speech, together with Peter's further explanations, produce the remarkable number of 3,000 conversions.

⁽⁶⁾ Cf. PESCH, *Apostelgeschichte*, 119; W. DE BOOR, *Die Apostelgeschichte* (WStB; Zürich 1989) 59; J. FITZMYER, *The Acts of the Apostles* (AB 18C, New York 1998) 250.

means to answer this question as his opening words indicate: ‘Let *this* be known to you; listen to my explanation ... *This* [which you have experienced] is what was spoken about by the prophet Joel...’ (vv. 14, 16). Peter aims at comprehension: his words will try to make satisfying sense of the crowd’s experience. To explain ‘what this means’, Peter proposes two answers, which, upon further thought, really form one⁽⁷⁾.

The speech is an intellectual exercise? Given the indicators in the Acts text which I have noted just above, it would be difficult to claim that the speech, which certainly contributed to the conversion of 3,000 persons, had as its goal to move the audience to an action (e.g., repentance, or baptism)⁽⁸⁾. The triumphant final verse of Peter’s uninterrupted presentation centers explicitly on the opening words addressing the intellect: ‘Let [the entire house of Israel] know therefore with conviction...’⁽⁹⁾. Certainly, the truth Peter claims is one which would eventually help lead his audience to a practical action, but this practical action and the call to it occur only after a dialogue and ‘many other words’ result in conversion. By itself, the Pentecost speech is a forceful argument that Jesus is Lord and Messiah of Israel; this is an intellectual argument, not a direct or explicit appeal to conversion, to practical action⁽¹⁰⁾.

(7) There are many other suggestions as to how to divide the speech. Cf., for example, C. TALBERT, *Reading Acts. A Literary and Theological Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles* (New York 1977) 44: ‘(a) The first part of Peter’s speech says that the phenomena of the day of Pentecost are a fulfillment of prophecy (vv. 16-21). (b) The second part of the address contends that the phenomena of Pentecost are the gift of the risen and exalted Christ (vv. 22-36)’. Cf. J. FITZMYER, *Acts*, 249, who divides the speech into 6 parts, to end with vv. 38-39. I would prefer to stress that v. 36 is the rhetorical goal of the entire speech.

(8) E. SCHWEIZER, “Concerning the Speeches in Acts”, *Studies in Luke-Acts*. Essays presented in honor of Paul Schubert (ed. L. KECK – J. MARTYN) (Philadelphia 1980) 208, holds that the speech runs from v. 14 to v. 38, inclusive.

(9) ‘a) en la primera parte del discurs Pere s’adreça als representants de totes les nacions, incloent-hi als jueus (ficció literària: vv. 14b-21), mentre que b) en la segona part se circumscriu als jueus reals (història: vv. 22-35). L’exposició va seguida normalment de la parenesi, aquí tot just esbossada (v. 36)’, J. RUI-CAMPS, *Comentari als Fets des Apòstols* (Madrid 1991) I, 109 (cf. further p.136). The crowds described by Luke, however, in Acts 2,5 make this distinction unnecessary, as does the final addressee of 2,36.

(10) Peter’s testimonial speech in Acts 3 is the clear example by which to show that when Luke wants to make exhortation to repentance an integral part of a discourse, he does it: ‘Therefore, reform your lives! Turn to God, that your sins may be wiped away!’ (v. 19). Indeed, all that follows these exhortations is motivation of various kinds to urge repentance.

Peter's speech, then, is explanatory, it intends to answer a question about meaning. It is in his development of a response to this question that we pose certain questions about his argumentation; let us proceed to these.

II. The Two Purposes of Peter's Speech

(1) First, Peter indicates, by means of the Joel quotation, that 'this experience means' that God has poured out His Spirit on His sons and daughters, on His servants and handmaids. The voices the crowd has heard, summed up as speech about the marvels of God, are defined as prophecy. Indeed, Luke has added the clause 'they shall prophesy', where Joel did not have it (cf. v. 18), to underscore the nature of the stunning, attention-getting gift given through the Spirit to the Christians. Thus, Peter's first response to the crowd is to offer the cause of what the crowd has experienced. 'What does this mean?' is understood to ask, 'What is the cause of our experience?', and the answer is in terms of cause-effect. In this way, 'what this means' is that God has, in the last days, poured out his Spirit. God had promised this, and now He has done it. The strength of this argument is based on coherency or fittingness.

(2) The second way in which Peter answers the question about meaning is to propose the purpose for which God has poured out His Spirit. Now it is not a question of meaning according to cause, but meaning according to intent. We are now interested, not in Who caused this experience of great wind and prophecy, but why did God cause this prophesying?

The best approach to identify the intent of God in causing this experience is to note that, materially, the Joel citation, as Luke chooses to excise it, runs far beyond the identification of cause of the crowd's experience. That is, the Joel citation goes far beyond cause (the Holy Spirit) and effect ('and they shall prophesy' [v. 18]); it ends with the affirmation: 'Then everyone who calls on the name of the Lord will be saved' (v. 21). This action, to call on the name of the Lord to be saved, is the ultimate goal or purpose or reason or divine intent to which the gift of the Spirit points. With the outpouring of the Spirit, and with the subsequent prophecy, we are recognizably in the last days so that, as Joel concludes, 'anyone who calls on the name of the Lord will be saved'. The crowd's question about the meaning of its experience, then, is answered, not simply in terms of cause-effect, but in terms of

the intent of God to bring about salvation. In simplest form, according to Peter, the crowd’s experience means that God has poured out His Spirit (divine cause), so that everyone who now calls on the name of the Lord will be saved (divine intent). Indeed, one can add that the recognition of the outpouring of the Spirit is the sign that God now wants and invites everyone to call on the name of the Lord to be saved.

The speech will be one element in the practical decision to convert; as such, it contains in itself this ultimate goal. But the speech itself falls short of this call to conversion; it has its own dynamism and self-contained purpose, which, once understood, will, with the help of many other arguments, contribute to move so many to the practical act of conversion⁽¹⁾.

It is to this second purpose of the Pentecostal speech that we turn, in particular to study its argumentation and its presuppositions. From a perusal of what follows (vv. 22-36) upon the Joel citation, we can say in advance that the ultimate goal of the second part of the Pentecostal speech is clarity about the true identity of Jesus of Nazareth, so recently judged ungodly and worthy of death. It is this clarification, rather than a call to conversion, that leads one to understand the Pentecostal speech as a discourse of explanation — who is Jesus of Nazareth, and why is he introduced into a speech concerned with the outpouring of the Spirit, so that ‘everyone who calls on the name of the Lord will be saved’? (v. 21). We seek clarification regarding the arguments Peter proposes in this section of his speech.

III. The Significance of Jesus of Nazareth

Complementing the Joel citation, and forming roughly a half of Peter’s speech, is a lengthy discussion about Jesus of Nazareth, all to end with the ringing (3rd person) command: ‘Let the house of Israel know with complete assurance that Jesus is Lord and Messiah’. One rightly asks the question, what does this lengthy presentation of Jesus have to do with the ‘meaning’ of the crowd’s experience? The answer is that, if one correctly understands that the gift of the Spirit signals the

⁽¹⁾ J. ROLOFF, *Die Apostelgeschichte* (NTD 5; Göttingen 1981) 51, notes: ‘Der Rede liegt ein klarer Aufbau zugrunde’ (1. vv. 14b-21; 2. 22-40: a. 22-23; b. 24-32; c. 33-35; d. 36-40)’. Such an understanding of what makes up the Pentecost speech strongly detracts from the effect of v. 36; there is a sure place for analysis of a speech by means of rhetorical criticism.

time to call upon the name of the Lord to be saved (v. 21), Jesus is that Lord and it is his name upon which one must call for salvation. All the explanation of the crowd's experience as the fulfillment of the Joel prophecy is meant to lead one to realize that now is the moment to call upon the name of the Lord for salvation; and all the rest of the discourse, about Jesus, is meant to establish this crucial element of the speech: that Jesus is the Lord upon whom one is to call for salvation.

The correct manner of arguing that Jesus is Lord is, as far as the Jewish Peter is concerned before his Jewish audience, to find the text which fits properly with the text of Joel; that is, Peter should bring together the text of Joel regarding Lord and another text, using the title Lord, a text which clearly can be associated with Jesus of Nazareth. Peter uses here what is elsewhere a known Rabbinic practice of interpreting one of God's Words (that of Joel) by another text of God's Word⁽¹²⁾.

To argue successfully that Jesus is Lord and thus to be called on for salvation, Peter draws upon the authoritative Old Testament Ps 110: 'The Lord [YHWH] said to my Lord...' ⁽¹³⁾. If it can be shown that Jesus is the second-mentioned Lord, the Lord of the psalmist (David), then, Peter contends, it is clear that the Joel citation speaks of Jesus when it asks everyone to call upon the name of Lord for salvation: Jesus is the Lord of Israel, and thus the Lord (pointed to by Joel) on whom one should call for salvation. It is to the argument of Peter, that Jesus is Lord⁽¹⁴⁾, that I direct my attention, and in particular to make three observations about that argument.

⁽¹²⁾ FITZMYER, *Acts*, 249, suggests that Luke is dependent for this speech on some Palestinian oral source; whether it be this kind of source or Luke's own familiarity with Jewish thinking, it seems that he saw the particular pertinence of joining for his Jewish audience two texts which, without Luke's effort, would remain of no interpretive help to each other and to the figure of Jesus of Nazareth.

⁽¹³⁾ ROLOFF, *Apostelgeschichte*, 53: 'Es gibt nur eine Konsequenz aus dem jetzigen Geschehen: den Namen Jesu anzurufen und so Rettung ... zu erlangen'.

⁽¹⁴⁾ That Jesus Lord can in some mysterious measure rightly be the Lord YHWH upon whom Joel said we are to call for salvation — this suggests what is noted by J. FITZMYER, *Luke*. Introduction, translation, and notes (AB 28; Garden City 1981) I, 203: 'In using *kyrios* of both YHWH and Jesus in his writings, Luke continues the sense of the title already being used in the early Christian community, which in some sense regarded Jesus as on a level with YHWH'. J.D.G. DUNN, *The Acts of the Apostles* (Peterborough 1996) 29: '...Jesus, the exalted Christ understood as a plenipotentiary of God'. 'Plenipotentiary' seems too conservative in light of Luke 1,35.

1. *Jesus Son of David*

Peter’s goal is to identify Jesus as Lord of Israel, but, as is clear from the presentation of his speech, that identification must follow upon other elements, presumably so because they are important to this ultimate identification and are part of the argument that Jesus is Lord.

Before speaking of Lord and in order to speak about that person, Peter is at pains to lead his audience to realize that Jesus is Messiah of Israel. To establish this identification, Peter uses a two-step argument. First, he cites Ps 16 for its words: ‘you will not let me remain in Hades; you will not let your holy one see corruption; my body will rest in hope; you will show me the ways to life and fill me with joy in your presence’ (Acts 2,27-28)⁽¹⁵⁾. Given that Jesus has been raised from the dead (the eye-witness testimony of Peter, vv. 24.32, is incontrovertible), one can understand and approve of applying the words of Ps 16 to the risen Jesus⁽¹⁶⁾. This application is especially correct, when one realizes that the Psalm is not speaking about David, but about a ‘part’ of David (i.e., the fruit of David’s loins): the first person usage in the Psalm is kept in tact by understanding the Psalmist to be speaking about a part of himself, his son. What the Psalmist says about ‘himself’ is to be understood to be about a part of himself, that is, his son.

Second, the Psalmist, of course, cannot be speaking about just any one of David’s descendants — that would make no sense; he must be speaking about that son who, as Ps 132 and 2 Sam 7 (Peter’s words would have suggested to his audience these scriptural loci) have been understood to say, is the Messiah. But this identification of Jesus with the fruit of the loins of David and with the Davidic son of Ps 132 and 2 Sam 7 — this means that Ps 16, when it shows that a part of David should not see corruption, speaks about that child of David who would some day sit on his throne as Messiah of Israel. But Peter has already

⁽¹⁵⁾ RUIS-CAMPS, *Comentari*, 140, suggests that one should look to vv. 26c, 27b as ‘prova de la impossibilitat que la Mort/l’Hades das al retingui soto el seu domini (v. 24b)’. However, the true reason for any hope of resurrection is the fact that ‘you are with me always lest I stumble’ (v. 25); all else follows (διὰ τοῦτο) from this.

⁽¹⁶⁾ PESCH, *Apostelgeschichte*, 122 links the impossibility that death hold Jesus on the one hand to Jesus’ being Messiah, the ‘Holy One’ and on the other hand to the fact that ‘Jesus hat durchweg in ganzer Gottesverbundenheit gelebt ... und ist nie wankend geworden’. Pesch also speaks of the ‘Jesu Lebensführung (vgl. V. 25b) ... die für Gott den Grund für seine Auferweckung abgab’. Similarly, DE BOOR, *Apostelgeschichte*, 63.

claimed that Ps 16, which we now know speaks about the Messiah, speaks about Jesus; indeed, the resurrection of Jesus, to which Peter testifies, occurred precisely because, as Ps 16 says, God would never abandon this son of David to Hades, would never let him corrupt, would show him the ways to life; as the Psalm further indicates, 'Because you are always at my side lest a stumble, I (i.e., Jesus) rejoice and my flesh will rest in hope' (Acts vv. 25-26) ⁽¹⁷⁾. The Psalm, then, speaks of Jesus and explains the remarkable 'resurrectional' fact to which Peter bears witness; but it also speaks about a son of David who, through adroit use of the scriptures can be no other than the Messiah of Israel. The risen Jesus of Nazareth, then, is Messiah, identified as Son of David. To show Jesus to be Lord, Peter has taken the step he thinks necessary to his goal: Jesus, by understanding Pss 16 and 132 in the light of the fact of Jesus' resurrections from the dead, is shown to be Messiah, Son of David. But is Jesus the Son of David, and thereby Messiah of Israel?

The one logical step Peter does not address in this argumentation is the identification of Jesus as Son of David. In fact, as Peter begins his description of Jesus, he calls Jesus 'the Nazarene' (v. 22), a title which separates Jesus from the heritage and even the physical territory of David. In other words, Jesus is risen (we can grant this on Peter's testimony), and Ps 16 can be understood to say that the Messiah will not see corruption, will not be left in Hades, but how can one logically apply the resurrection hopes of Ps 16 to Jesus, if Peter does not show Jesus to be Son of David ⁽¹⁸⁾?

Should Peter have demonstrated that Jesus is Son of David ⁽¹⁹⁾? Perhaps, but Luke is not accustomed to provide speeches much longer than this Pentecost speech; the speech of Stephen is the exception to this rule. On the other hand, Luke has already argued strenuously in

⁽¹⁷⁾ More simply put is Acts 10,38: 'God was always with him'; cf. ROLOFF, *Apostelgeschichte*, 57: Jesus died 'in nie getrübten Gottesgewissheit'.

⁽¹⁸⁾ One can argue that since the Messiah is son of David and Jesus is the Messiah, then Jesus must be son of David; but this is to argue the reverse of what Peter argues: for Peter, the argument is that because Jesus is son of David, he is Messiah. not that because Jesus is Messiah, he is son of David.

⁽¹⁹⁾ '...the long history of the interpretation and reinterpretation of the Davidic prophecies formed two streams. One emphasizes a Messianic figure, God's Son of Davidic descent...' (E. SCHWEIZER, "The Concept of the 'Davidic Son of God' in Acts and Its Old Testament Background", *Studies in Luke-Acts*. Essays presented in honor of Paul Schubert [ed. L. KECK – J. MARTYN] [Philadelphia 1980] 191).

the Infancy Narratives, already read by Theophilus, that Jesus is Son of David and Messiah. Luke could assume this knowledge about Jesus as regards his readers, and so need not repeat the argument in its favor once again. But this literary dependency of the opening speech of Acts upon the opening chapters of the Gospel, while it offers Theophilus vital information about the identity of Jesus, is of no value to Peter’s Pentecost argument, for the argument is addressed, not to people who know the Infancy Narratives, but to people who know only the public life of Jesus.

Peter’s Pentecost speech, however re-worked by Luke, would suggest that the audience knows only about the public life of Jesus. Acts 10,38-39 also suggests this. The Pentecost speech lays great weight upon Jesus’ powerful acts, his ‘signs and wonders and miracles’ (Acts 2, 22). No speech in Acts, however re-edited by Luke, shows awareness of the Davidic font Luke reveals in the beginning of his Gospel. This factor speaks both for the fidelity of Luke to early presentations of the person of Jesus, as well as for the great strides he made with his Infancy Narratives, but still leaves us with a lacuna in the argument that Jesus is Messiah because he is Son of David.

Indeed, one looks in vain in the public life of Jesus for an argument that Jesus is Son of David⁽²⁰⁾. One might point to the one occasion on which Jesus is addressed as Son of David by a blind man (Luke 18,38.39), but this hardly explains how it is that Jesus can be called Son of David; certainly, it offers no argument that he comes from David. The only sure conclusion to draw in this matter is that Luke, in presenting the speech of Peter, must presume that his readers will know (and therefore not need to be shown) that Jesus of Nazareth is Jesus Son of David. The daring conclusion to be drawn is that, somehow in his ‘other words’ (Acts 2,40), Peter succeeds in showing that Jesus of Nazareth is born from David; but with what information would he have argued to the conclusion?

There is a lacuna, then, in Peter’s argumentation. To know that Jesus is Son of David will cap an already powerful argument that Jesus is Messiah of Israel; but, is Jesus of Nazareth the Son of David? He certainly is, if one knows Luke’s infancy narratives, but without them...

⁽²⁰⁾ J. FITZMYER, *Luke*. Introduction, translation, and notes (AB 28A; Garden City 1985) II, 1310, notes V. Taylor’s remark concerning Jewish adversaries ‘who laid stress on the necessity of actual physical descent’ from David for the Messiah.

2. *Jesus: (Messiah and) Lord*

The Petrine argument that Jesus has been invited by God to sit at His right hand as Lord in royal supremacy — this claim is based on Jesus' most recent experience: he has been taken up to God's right hand (Acts 2,33). It is only a logical step to conclude that the ascension of Jesus completes the resurrection to which Peter bears absolutely trustworthy witness. Why, then, has Peter not directly argued this way: the resurrected Jesus has, logically, been taken to God's right hand, and, once there, has been asked to sit at God's right hand? To what end does the identification of Jesus as Messiah serve? Is not the eye-witness of Jesus' being taken up sufficient argument to show that Jesus has to be the Lord about whom David spoke?

Actually, no, it is not sufficient. That Jesus is ascended does not make it certain that Jesus should be known as the Lord about whom David spoke, the Lord of all Israel; ascension need not translate into Lordship. One looks anxiously in Peter's words for the logical and explicit connection which would link Jesus of Nazareth inexorably with the 'Lord' of David, and does not find it.

If, however, one could assume that Jesus, now shown to be Messiah of Israel, is thereby Lord of Israel, one would have the desired logical link between the risen and ascended Jesus and the Jesus called Lord at God's right hand. That is, if it could be argued that the Lord of Israel is Messiah, then one can see the purpose in identifying Jesus as Messiah before presenting him as Lord⁽²¹⁾.

The link we need and look for can be found, not in the speech of Peter, not in Acts, but in the Gospel of Luke. In Luke 20,41-44, Luke presents a story in which Jesus challenges the wise men of Israel through the means of a question, the answer to which must, as the argument makes clear, cohere with a popular citation from Psalms. The question is: 'How do they say that the Messiah is Son of David' (v. 41). What stands in the way of this association of Messiah with Son of David is the contradiction raised by the words of Ps 110, which bear witness that David calls this Messiah his Lord. Cannot the Messiah be both Lord of David, which he certainly is, and Son of David, which apparently he is not? Jesus puts the question in a

⁽²¹⁾ One might suggest that 'to sit on his throne', v. 30, is a signal from Peter that the audience should identify this 'sitting' with the words to the Lord: 'sit at my right', v. 34. But this link, if it be the only one, is weak because there is too much to say that is not said about the identification of 'his throne' (that of David) with the place at the right hand of YHWH.

negative way: surely the Messiah, known to everyone as Lord of David, cannot at the same time be Son of David! The important thing to note about this argument, for our purposes, is that this entire argument hangs on everyone's acceptance of the statement that the Messiah is Lord of David, or, to put it another way, the entire argument hangs on the correctness of the statement that the Messiah is Lord. No one present at this argument of Jesus denies or even questions the assertion of Jesus, that the Messiah is the Lord of David. More positively, everyone acknowledges that the Lord of Ps 110, who is asked to sit at God's right hand, is the Messiah.

The common teaching (however it was arrived at) in Jesus' Israel is that the Messiah, he who is invited to sit at God's right hand, is the Lord. Mark had witnessed to this interpretation before Luke, in Mark 12,35-37, and Matthew reveals the same teaching, Matthew 22,41-46⁽²²⁾. These authors indicate the breadth and certainty of everyone in Jesus' contemporary society that Lord is Messiah.

Here, then, is the presumption that undergirds Peter's lengthy argument that Jesus qualifies to be Lord of Israel. Having shown Jesus to be Messiah, Peter can now talk about 'this Jesus' (v. 31) as having been taken to God's right hand. To this Jesus, the Messiah — to this one God speaks the wonderful words: 'Sit at my right hand'. With the association of Messiah with Lord already common currency among his audience, and with Jesus shown to be Messiah, Peter need only recall the ascension of Jesus (to which Peter was eye-witness) to complete the argument: Jesus is Lord of Israel.

Luke willingly takes over this story from Mark, in order to bring the public, contentious part of the Jerusalem experience to an end, with a challenge, within the Gospel, to plumb deeply the true identity of Jesus; the story (Luke 20,41-44) has its own vital function within the Gospel. But, as it serves to resume what was said in the opening infancy narratives, so it can extend to prepare, as a prolepsis, an explanation of the logic of Peter's argument in Acts 2: if one wishes to find the Lord (upon whom one calls for salvation), one need only find him who is Messiah, for he, everyone knows, is Lord.

Of course, it can be well and justly argued that Luke, through Peter, has a particular, long-range interest in the title Messiah as Luke

⁽²²⁾ Representing a still earlier period in the tradition than Mark's Gospel redaction, Paul writes confidently of 'Jesus Christ our Lord' (Rom 1,4) without need for proof of this identity for Jesus.

opens his book with this first missionary speech of Acts⁽²³⁾. As Acts shows, Messiah will become the preferred title for Jesus; Luke insists that Paul, 'as was his custom', took whatever amount of time was needed to show in the synagogues of the Mediterranean that 'this is the Messiah Jesus whom I announce to you' (Acts 17, 2-3). So insistent is this kind of teaching that followers of Jesus became known as Christians (Acts 11,26), Messiah-people⁽²⁴⁾. Even if Peter had his own broader use of 'Jesus Messiah' in mind, the function of the identification of Jesus as Messiah in this speech is clearly to link Jesus of Nazareth with the eventual goal of the speech: Jesus is 'Lord', upon whom one calls for salvation⁽²⁵⁾.

Thus, whatever overarching value to Acts lies in quickly identifying Jesus as Messiah, the title, in this speech, is presented and proved worthy of Jesus because it strategically closes the gap between the two elements of Peter's argument: 'Jesus' and 'Lord of Israel'. Contrarily, there is no appeal, as one will find in Paul's conversion stories, to an already enthroned Jesus breaking into human experience from on high and in this way proving that Jesus is Lord; Peter's fidelity to his experience makes him follow the kerygmatic line: public life, death, resurrection, ascension, session. The resurrection of Jesus is not only the steppingstone to the ascension and the session which identifies Jesus as Lord. But, as Peter's argument shows so clearly, by virtue of the resurrection Jesus is revealed as Messiah, and being Messiah is key to being Lord. Thus, in giving his audience an account of the path of Jesus of Nazareth to the right hand of God, Peter perfects his argument by indicating, not only the reality of the resurrected Jesus, but the reality of the risen Messiah. To Peter's mind, the surest

⁽²³⁾ As TALBERT, *Reading Acts*, 47, notes: 'In Acts as a whole, Peter's speech functions as a frontispiece'. Cf. ROLOFF, *Apostelgeschichte*, 48: 'Die Predigt ist hinsichtlich ihrer Stellung und Funktion mit der Antritts-Predigt Jesu in Nazaret (Lk 4,16-30) vergleichbar'.

⁽²⁴⁾ 'Christian' will not erase from Acts the memory of the disciples of Jesus called 'The Way': 9,2; 19,9,23; 22,4; 24,14,22. While other, non-biblical groups referred to a religious life as 'a way', it seems reasonable to identify the immediate cause of the Christian 'Way' through such a use as we find in Luke's Gospel: 'You [Jesus] in truth teach the way of God' (Luke 20,21); cf. also Zachary's words about the purpose of the Messiah: 'to set their feet on the way to peace' (Luke 1,79).

⁽²⁵⁾ J. DUPONT, *Études sur les Actes des Apôtres* (LeDiv 45; Paris 1967) 404, draws a close parallel between the programmatic speeches of Luke (4,16-30) and Acts (2,14-36) particularly because the presentation of Jesus as Messiah is so underlined and vigorous.

way to argue that Jesus is Lord is to argue that Jesus, raised from the dead, is Messiah⁽²⁶⁾. What needs be taken for granted is that whoever be the Messiah is Lord; this truth is not part of the speech, but it is part of the mindset of those engaged in it⁽²⁷⁾.

Again it is clear that, however forceful might be the explicit argumentation of Peter on behalf of his conclusion that Jesus is Lord, it is helpful to know what is not in the speech in order to make Peter’s claim most persuasive. The earliest preachings in Jerusalem can rely on the general, public assumption that whoever is Messiah is, in accord with David’s testimony (Ps 110), truly Lord of Israel⁽²⁸⁾. It is by adroit reasoning that one realizes that this Messiah, the Lord of Israel, is Jesus of Nazareth.

3. *Jesus, the Holy Spirit, and, mysteriously, the Father*

The last elements of v. 33 seem out of place: ‘he (Jesus) poured out this which you see and hear’. I say ‘out of place’, because with the introduction of Jesus at v. 22, Peter has finished with the identification of Spirit as the source of the phenomena the crowd experiences and moves on to explain why it is Jesus whom one calls upon for salvation. The final words of v. 33, as they call attention to a matter already handled, seem to interrupt the flow of Peter’s christological argument..

However, one realizes that only with difficulty could Peter have put Jesus’ action of pouring out the Spirit in the first half of his speech; such a statement would have needed a discussion of Jesus of Nazareth, and at that point in the speech such an effort would be out of place. All

⁽²⁶⁾ ROLOFF, *Apostelgeschichte*, 54: ‘Ps 110,1 ... gab ... die Möglichkeit für eine Verbindung des Kyrios — mit dem Christus (= Messias)-Titel (vgl. Mk 12,35-37)’, this is true, but only if one understands that Peter’s audience knew what Luke supposes Jesus’ audience to understand at Mark 12.

⁽²⁷⁾ BRUCE, *Acts*, 124: ‘It seems to have been a matter of general knowledge among Jesus’ early followers that his lineage could actually be traced back to David; if this was accepted, the growth of a primitive “Son of David” christology was inevitable’. ROLOFF, *Apostelgeschichte*, 57: ‘In der Tat ist die Zugehörigkeit Jesu zum davidischem Geschlecht ein in der Überlieferung fest verankertes Faktum (vgl. Mk 10,48)’. But Mark 10,48 is no sure text by which to argue that Jesus was born from the lineage of David.

⁽²⁸⁾ FITZMYER, *Luke*, II, 1311: ‘There is simply no evidence of the Davidic messianic interpretation of Psalm 110 in pre-Christian Palestinian Judaism’. (Contra, e.g., ROLOFF, *Apostelgeschichte*, 54.) But, even if this identification were to belong to the Christian community, there must be some reason in traditional Judaism that would justify this equation. Certainly, Jesus ascended cannot alone account for a later application of ‘Lord’ to him.

in all, if there is need to assert that it was Jesus who poured out the Spirit, Peter has chosen, with Jesus ascended to God's right hand, the right moment to present this work of Jesus, though the reference to Jesus remains a bit awkward⁽²⁹⁾.

The greater question, to which the phrasing of v. 33 gives rise, has to do with God. That is, throughout the entire speech of Peter there is reference only to 'God' ⁽³⁰⁾ — with one exception: in the latter part of v. 33, where we read that '[he] having received the promised Holy Spirit [epexegetical genitive⁽³¹⁾] from the Father...'. Why this change, this unique use of 'Father' in place of 'God'? After all the Joel citation is clear that it is God who is the source of the outpouring of the Spirit. As in previous discussions, so here: there is nothing in the speech itself which warrants this change of vocabulary⁽³²⁾. We must go elsewhere, indeed backwards, to gain some understanding of what we find in v. 33⁽³³⁾.

Near the very end of his Gospel Luke cites Jesus' words, 'I will send the promise of my Father upon you' (Luke 24,49). The statement of Peter at Acts 2,33 repeats the essence of this word of Jesus, and again offers the peculiarity that when Jesus is associated with the Spirit and with God, the proper term is not 'God' but '(my) Father'.

Luke records Jesus' speaking about 'the Spirit from my Father'. Within the Lucan work there is one other significant use of this particularized vocabulary. At Luke 10,21, Jesus begins an address to 'Father' and repeats, in 10,22 such a reference twice; once he states that 'All has been given me from my Father' and then, as a conclusion, that

⁽²⁹⁾ Cf. O. BAUERFEIND, *Kommentar und Studien zur Apostelgeschichte* (WUNT 22; Tübingen 1980) 48: 'In v 33 wird sie nun deutlich ausgesprochen und damit inhaltlich das Ziel der Rede erreicht'.

⁽³⁰⁾ Without reference to terms in the Old Testament quotations, one finds 'God' used 8 times by Peter.

⁽³¹⁾ E. ACQUIRE, *Les Actes des Apôtres* (EtB; Paris 1926) 74: 'génitif objectif'.

⁽³²⁾ G. STÄHLIN, *Die Apostelgeschichte*. Übersetzt und erklärt (NTD 5; Göttingen 1962) 49-50, looks to Romans 1,4 as indication that the Lord will pour out the Spirit, the Lord who is in power, the Lord who is Son. But there still remains the question, why change vocabulary, Lord (or Messiah) to Son, when not God, but the Father, pours out the Spirit. Indeed, why, in a speech concerned with Jesus Lord, does Peter suddenly introduce the Son as the one who gives the Spirit? Similarly, one can press the opinion of J. DUPONT, *Nouvelles Études sur les Actes des Apôtres* (LeDiv 118; Paris 1984) 241-242, where association is drawn between 1 Timothy 4,16 and Acts 2,33: the Spirit poured out on the occasion of the Pascal glory of Jesus Messiah and Lord.

⁽³³⁾ Cf. BAUERFEIND, *Kommentar*, 49: 'Damit ist jedoch wieder nicht ausgeschlossen, dass Lk in dieser Zusammenfassung auch ältere Ausdrucksweisen berücksichtigt, die ihre Form schon früher erhalten haben'.

knowledge of the Father and of the Son is reserved. Apparently, this gift of all things and this unique knowledge are not what can be expressed as shared by ‘God’ and Jesus. To learn certain things about Jesus, one must think of him as Son of this Father and of God as Father of this Son⁽³⁴⁾.

Could there lie behind this peculiar Lucan indication of Jesus’ relationship to God some reference to Jesus’ being Son of God, by virtue of the Power of God and the Spirit of God? Luke is insistent that Jesus be called Son of God as the logical (Luke 1,35) effect of what caused him to be. Once the child of this conception can speak for himself, he calls attention, not to ‘my God’, but to ‘my Father’ (Luke 2, 49). Though our thoughts remain fragmentary, because our data to work with is quite limited, it seems that Luke has left us enough material to understand rudimentarily that indeed there is a mysterious relationship among Father, Son and Spirit, which is not foreign or contradictory to such an expression as we have in Acts 2,33.

The closeness in phrasing between Matthew (11, 25-27) and Luke (10, 21-22) in regard to the Son known only by the Father and the Father known only by the Son suggest that Luke is drawing from a tradition, and not from his own unique way of understanding Jesus, when Peter suddenly, in mid-speech so to speak, shifts his terminology, vis-à-vis the gift of the Spirit, from ‘God’ and ‘Jesus Messiah’⁽³⁵⁾ to Father and Son.

⁽³⁴⁾ It is not clear that what we have at Luke 11,13 is still another use of the vocabulary ‘Father-Son’ of which we are speaking in this essay. On the one hand, we do find in 11,13 the absolute use of ‘Father’, presumably a term which includes not only the disciples, but Jesus, too. On the other hand, ‘Father’ here, in that it follows upon the prayer of Jesus introduced by ‘Father’, addresses, not the relationship of Jesus to the Father, but of Jesus’ followers to their Father — a relationship which is, as the New Testament strongly indicates, significantly different from Jesus’ own sonship vis-à-vis his Father.

⁽³⁵⁾ To some Peter’s speech suggests that Jesus as Messiah pours out the Holy Spirit. Noted is the following: *T. Judah* (αβS¹) 24,2-3: καὶ ἀνοιγήσονται ἐπ’ αὐτῷ οἱ οὐρανοὶ ἐκχέαι πνεῦμα εὐλογία πατρὸς ἁγίου, καὶ αὐτὸς ἐκχεεῖ πνεῦμα χάριτος ἐφ’ ὑμᾶς (*The Greek Versions of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*. Edited from Nine Mss together with the Variants of the Armenian and Slavonic versions and some Hebrew fragments [ed. R.H. CHARLES] [Hildesheim ²1960] 102). But to whom does αὐτός refer? For R.H. Charles (*The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament in English* [ed. R.H. Charles] [Oxford 1913] II, 324) αὐτός, the subject of ‘will pour out’, is the Holy Father (in accord with Ps 45,3). TALBERT, *Reading Acts*, 45, understands the subject of this verb to be the star rising from Jacob (ἄστρον ἐξ Ἰακώβ), (mentioned in the verse preceding the Greek text cited above) i.e., the Messiah. For all that, Peter seems to prefer Jesus be called Son of the Father rather than Messiah, when Jesus is described as he who pours out the Holy Spirit.

There is, then, in Luke (Luke 1 and 2) and in his sources (Luke 10) related to Matthew material which would make Theophilus an intelligent reader of what Peter proposes in Acts 2,33. But, in accord with the particular slant of Acts 2,33 (and Luke 24) — that Jesus pours out the Spirit from his Father — we turn to John's Gospel.

John's Gospel offers still further witness to the terms which must be used when speaking of this relationship among Father, Son and Spirit. In John 14, Jesus twice makes reference to the giving or sending of the Spirit. At v. 14, Jesus promises: 'I will ask the Father and he will give you another Paraclete...the Spirit of truth'. At vv. 25-26, Jesus notes: 'the Paraclete, the Holy Spirit whom the Father will send in my name...'. In John 15,26, however, Jesus remarks: 'When the Paraclete comes, the Spirit of truth who comes from the Father — and whom I myself will send from the Father...'. John's citations of Jesus' words are in close accord with Peter's double expression: on the one hand, 'God has poured out his Spirit', and on the other 'Jesus Messiah, having received the Spirit, poured out what you see and hear'. Jesus' sending of the Spirit is soon confirmed: at John 16,7, Jesus again says that 'the Paraclete ... I will send him to you...'. Finally, Jesus at John 16,14-15 notes, '...he (the Spirit) will have received from me what he will announce to you. All that the Father has belongs to me; that is why I said that what he will announce to you he will have from me' ⁽³⁶⁾.

The similarities between John and Luke ⁽³⁷⁾, centered in the above statements, suggest once again that there is an assumption in the Petrine discourse at Pentecost: that the reader will be able to understand the sudden, unexplained and abruptly terminated preference for the terminology, Father, Son, Spirit, when Peter introduces the report that Jesus Messiah poured out 'what you see and hear'.

*
* * *

The goal of Peter's Pentecost discourse is to present to his audience a right understanding of the phenomena it has just

⁽³⁶⁾ Noteworthy is the interchange apparent in Luke's citing Jesus' words: at Luke 12,12, Jesus notes that 'the Holy Spirit will teach you at that moment [a moment of persecution] what to say', while with ease Jesus says, at Luke 21,15: 'I will give you words and a wisdom which none of your adversaries can take exception to or contradict'. Jesus in Acts pours out the Spirit who gives disciples the gift of prophecy, the gift of 'what they are to say'.

⁽³⁷⁾ BRUCE, *Acts*, 127 calls attention, without further explanation, to the Johannine texts cited above, as does ROLOFF, *Apostelgeschichte*, 59.

experienced. This right understanding is that God gave His Spirit to Jesus of Nazareth, who has poured out the Spirit of God to cause prophecy. The significance, i.e., the purpose of this outpouring of the Spirit is that anyone who now calls on the name of the Lord Jesus will be saved⁽³⁸⁾. The Petrine discourse is powerful in its use of Scripture and tradition, but it assumes, probably because Luke wanted it to be brief, that Jesus is son of David (and thus qualified to be identified as Messiah), that the Messiah is that Lord to whom YHWH said, ‘Sit at my right hand’, and that, when one speaks about the giving of the Spirit, one should talk of Father and Son, not simply of God and Jesus of Nazareth. Peter’s audience, Luke’s reader — these groups are expected to understand these assumptions from what Luke has presented in his first volume. In particular, one cannot overestimate the importance of Luke 1,35 for a full understanding of this opening speech of Acts. Certainly, the Petrine discourse is, for this dependence, best understood to be a ‘literary’ speech, that is a speech which depends for its full power on a reading of Luke’s entire work and an acquaintance, probably through earlier teaching, with the traditions Luke (and perhaps the already instructed Theophilus) had at hand.

Pontifical Biblical Institute
I-00187 Roma

John J. KILGALLEN, SJ

SUMMARY

The complete effectiveness of Peter’s Pentecost speech implies that the Lucan audience, if not that of Peter, knows at least three assumptions that are needed to make the speech as logically convincing as possible. These three assumptions are: (1) that Jesus is physically Son of David; (2) that the *kyrios* of Ps 110,1 is the Messiah; (3) that only the titles ‘Son’ and ‘Father’ should be used when describing that it is Jesus who poured out the Spirit. As for Peter’s audience, the fact that Peter supported his speech with ‘many other words (arguments)’ might argue that his audience were introduced to these three assumptions. As for Luke’s audience, Luke 1,35 and its context play a major role in justifying the logic of this Pentecost speech.

⁽³⁸⁾ ‘The proclamation is of Jesus. Its climactic point, therefore, is the significance of the Pentecost event for their understanding of the status and significance of Jesus’, DUNN, *Acts*, 31. But to leave out the Lucan placement of God in v. 36 is to run the risk of bypassing the relationship of God to Jesus. That Jesus is, by status and significance, savior of the world begins Acts’ incessant insistence that for salvation one is to look to him; thus, the essence of Jesus’ life is now to be replayed: he is the *archegos* of life, in person, power and word.

ANIMADVERSIONES

Beobachtungen zum Verbrennungsritus bei Schlachtopfer und Gemeinschafts-Schlachtopfer

In der nachfolgenden Untersuchung werden zwei Texte über das Schlachtopfer sowie das Gemeinschafts-Schlachtopfer, die aus unterschiedlichen Epochen stammen, ausgewertet und verglichen. Dabei sind verschiedene Differenzen zwischen den Verläufen der Opfer zu beobachten. Dennoch gleichen sich beide Texte darin, dass dem Akt der Verbrennung besondere kultische Bedeutung zukommt.

1. Das Schlachtopfer nach 1 Sam 2,12-17

Einblicke in die frühe Ritualpraxis des Schlachtopfers (זֶבֶחַ) vermittelt der Bericht über das kultische Fehlverhalten der Söhne Elis (1 Sam 2,12-17)⁽¹⁾. Bei diesem Text stellt sich allerdings eingangs die Frage nach Gliederung und Übersetzung. Meist wird der Abschnitt in V. 13-16 insgesamt als Darstellung des Fehlverhaltens der Elisöhne verstanden, das aus zwei Unregelmäßigkeiten bestehe:

Während das Fleisch des (zerlegten) Opfertieres gekocht wird, sticht der Diener des Priesters (נָעַר הַכֹּהֵן) mit einer dreizackigen Gabel⁽²⁾ in die Töpfe hinein. Was immer er dabei an Fleisch hervorholt, fällt dem Priester als sein Anteil zu (V. 13-14).

Der zweite Aspekt des frevelhaften Verhaltens wird exemplarisch anhand einer dialogischen Szene zwischen Diener und Opfergeber dargestellt. Noch bevor das Fett des Opfers verbrannt wird, fordert der Diener des Priesters schon das Fleisch zum Braten, wobei besonders betont wird, dass es roh sein

⁽¹⁾Über die Datierung von 1 Sam 2,12-17 differieren die Ansichten. P.K. McCARTER, Jr., *1 Samuel. A New Translation with Introduction, Notes & Commentary* (AncB 8; New York 1980) 83, vermutet in dem Text "an authentic recollection of pre-Deuteronomic practice". I. WILLI-PLEIN, *Opfer und Kult im alttestamentlichen Israel*. Textbefragungen und Zwischenergebnisse (SBS 153; Stuttgart 1993) 75, hält es für unsicher, ob die hier geschilderte Kultpraxis tatsächlich der Zeit des Übergangs zum Königtum entspricht, geht aber von vorexilischen Verhältnissen aus. W. ZWICKEL, *Räucher kult und Räuchergeräte*. Exegetische und archäologische Studien zum Räucheropfer im Alten Testament (OBO 97; Freiburg [Schweiz] – Göttingen 1990) 174, datiert die Erzählung als Polemik gegen das Heiligtum in Schilo in das späte 11. Jh. v. Chr. Alle Vorschläge zur Datierung gehen also von einem sehr alten Text aus.

⁽²⁾Erwähnenswert ist, dass dreizackige Gabeln, die als Fleischgabeln verwendet wurden, bei archäologischen Grabungen entdeckt worden sind; sie waren vom 14. Jh. bis etwa 1000 v. Chr. in Palästina, Syrien und Zypern in Gebrauch (vgl. ZWICKEL, *Räucher kult*, 157-161; vgl. 174). Die Nennung dieser Gabel bestätigt also auf ihre Weise die Datierung des Textabschnittes.

soll (V. 15-16). Diese Kultpraktiken werden in der abschließenden Bemerkung als Sünde disqualifiziert (V. 17)⁽³⁾.

Da also im Sinne des hier skizzierten Verständnisses die Abschnitte in V. 13-14 und V. 15-16 zwei verschiedene Facetten der kultischen Verfehlung darstellen, wird charakteristischerweise die Konjunktion **וְגַם בְּזֶרֶם** in V. 15, in dieser Verbindung *hapax legomenon*, mit steigendem Sinn wiedergegeben: "Desgleichen, ehe..."⁽⁴⁾; "Sogar ehe..."⁽⁵⁾; "Noch bevor..."⁽⁶⁾; "Auch, bevor..."⁽⁷⁾; "Ferner, bevor..."⁽⁸⁾; "Und ehe..."⁽⁹⁾; "Moreover, before..."⁽¹⁰⁾; "Même avant..."⁽¹¹⁾.

Diese vorangehend beschriebene Interpretation von 1 Sam 2,13-16 ist heute weit verbreitet. Sie ist aber wenigstens in dreifacher Hinsicht problematisch: Erstens ist die Differenz zwischen der in V. 13-14 beschriebenen Methode zur Eintreibung des Priesteranteils mittels dreizackiger Gabel und den Anweisungen in Lev 7,28-36; Dtn 18,3 usw. zwar offenkundig, da dort jeweils genau bezeichnete Teile des Opfertieres dem Priester zugewiesen werden. Die Praxis in 1 Sam 2,13-14 muß demgegenüber als ungewöhnlich erscheinen. Anhand dieses Vergleiches läßt sich allerdings keine Aussage darüber fällen, ob 1 Sam 2,13-14 in der Tat ein unregelmäßiges oder ggf. doch nur ein eigenartiges, aber legitimes Verhalten schildert, da der Text in eine frühere Epoche als die beiden Pentateuchtexte zu datieren ist und vorstaatliche Verhältnisse widerspiegelt. Zweitens muß aufgrund formaler Beobachtungen geltend gemacht werden, dass V. 13-14 eine in sich geschlossene, sachlich gehaltene Beschreibung ist, die sich von der dialogisch gehaltenen, z. T. geradezu emotionalen Beispielerzählung in V. 15-16 deutlich abhebt. Entsprechend diesen unterschiedlichen formalen Kriterien sind in beiden Abschnitten eher ungleiche Inhalte zu erwarten. Aufschlußreich ist in diesem Zusammenhang, dass zu V. 13-14 eine Parallele in Dtn 18,3 vorliegt, eine Beschreibung von Priesteranteilen. Aufgrund der Analogie empfiehlt sich, auch 1 Sam 2,13-14 als Darstellung der üblichen Art und Weise zu verstehen, wie in Schilo der Priesteranteil eingetrieben wurde. Drittens sollte nicht außer Acht bleiben, dass die in 1 Sam 2,12-17 beschriebenen Mißstände mit der Gerichtsverkündung durch "einen Mann Gottes" in V. 27-36 korrespondieren. Dort wird in V. 29 nochmals kurz

⁽³⁾Die in dieser Weise skizzierte, übliche Übersetzung und Interpretation von 1 Sam 2,12-17 findet sich z. B. in der *Revidierten Lutherübersetzung* (1965, 1975, 1984); *Einheitsübersetzung* (1974, 1985); *New Oxford Annotated Bible*; *Revised Standard Version*; *Sainte Bible. Nouvelle version selon rev.* (1978), jeweils *ad loc.*; ferner bei R. DE VAUX, *Les Institutions de l'Ancien Testament* (Paris 1991), II, 308 ("...on reprochait aux fils d'Éli, à Silo, de piquer un morceau au hasard de la fourchette dans le pot où l'on faisait bouillir la viande..."); WILLI-PLEIN, *Opfer und Kult*, 75.

⁽⁴⁾*Revidierte Lutherübersetzung* (*ad loc.*).

⁽⁵⁾*Elberfelder Bibel*. Revidierte Fassung (1985) und *Zürcher Bibel* (1970) (jeweils *ad loc.*).

⁽⁶⁾*Einheitsübersetzung* (*ad loc.*).

⁽⁷⁾*Echterbibel* (1949) (*ad loc.*).

⁽⁸⁾H. W. HERTZBERG, *Die Samuelbücher* (ATD 10; Göttingen 1960) 22.

⁽⁹⁾*Heilige Schrift des Alten Testaments*. Übersetzt von E. Kautzsch (Tübingen 1922) I, 411 (*ad loc.*).

⁽¹⁰⁾*New Oxford Annotated Bible*; *Revised Standard Version* (jeweils *ad loc.*).

⁽¹¹⁾*Sainte Bible* (*ad loc.*).

Bezug auf die regelwidrige Kultpraxis genommen: “Warum also verachtest du⁽¹²⁾ mein Opfer und meine Gabe (...) ? Du hast deine Söhne mehr als mich geehrt, indem ihr euch gemästet habt von dem Besten von jedem Opfer Israels, meines Volkes”. Mit diesen Worten liegt wohl ein Bezug auf die Einforderung des Opferfleisches vor der Fettverbrennung (V. 15-16) vor, nicht aber auf die Methode der Beschaffung dieses Anteils mittels der dreizackigen Gabel (V. 13-14).

Angesichts dieser Überlegungen empfiehlt sich eine alternative Gliederung und Übersetzung von 1 Sam 2,13-16: Dieser Text besteht aus zwei Abschnitten, die formal *und inhaltlich* verschieden sind. Der erste Abschnitt in V. 13-14 ist keine Darstellung frevelhafter Kultpraxis, sondern vielmehr eine Regelung der Priesteranteile und kann als “Opfertarif”⁽¹³⁾ bezeichnet werden. Erst der zweite Abschnitt in V. 15-16 thematisiert vor diesem Hintergrund anhand der exemplarischen Dialogszene die verwerfliche Kultpraxis der Elisöhne. Da die beiden Abschnitte V. 13-14 und V. 15-16 nach dieser Auffassung einen Kontrast darstellen, ist die Konjunktion **וְכֵן** in V. 15 adversativ⁽¹⁴⁾ zu verstehen: “Aber..., schon bevor...”⁽¹⁵⁾; “...jedoch, noch bevor...”⁽¹⁶⁾; “[But now] even before...”⁽¹⁷⁾.

Der Abschnitt 1 Sam 2,12-17 wäre anhand der vorangegangenen Überlegungen wie folgt zu übersetzen:

¹²Die Söhne Elis waren Nichtsnutze. Sie kümmerten sich nicht um JHWH. ¹³Der Anteil der Priester vom Volk ist: Wenn jemand ein Schlachtopfer darbringt, dann kommt der Diener des Priesters, während das Fleisch kocht, mit einer⁽¹⁸⁾ dreizackigen Gabel in der Hand. ¹⁴Und er sticht in den Kessel oder den Topf⁽¹⁹⁾. All das, was die Gabel hervorholt, nimmt der Priester mit ihr. So verfuhr man mit ganz Israel, das dorthin kam. In Schilo⁽²⁰⁾ ¹⁵aber, bevor man das Fett räucherte, kam der Diener des Priesters und sagte zu dem Opfernden: “Gib Fleisch zum Braten für den Priester, denn er nimmt von dir kein gekochtes Fleisch, sondern (nur) rohes”. ¹⁶Wenn der Mann zu ihm

⁽¹²⁾ Mit LXX und 4QSam^a ist die singularische Lesart gegen MT (רבעט) zu bevorzugen.

⁽¹³⁾ Zu dieser Bezeichnung vgl. ZWICKEL, *Räucher kult*, 172. Auch McCARTER, *I Samuel*, 82-83, sowie F. STOLZ, *Das erste und zweite Buch Samuel* (ZBK.AT 9; Zürich 1981) 33, interpretieren 1 Sam 2,13-14 als Beschreibung der regulären Kultpraxis.

⁽¹⁴⁾ Zum adversativen Gebrauch von **וְכֵן** vgl. ferner Ez18,11; Ps 129,2; Hi 18,5.

⁽¹⁵⁾ STOLZ, *Samuel*, 32.

⁽¹⁶⁾ ZWICKEL, *Räucher kult*, 171.

⁽¹⁷⁾ J. MILGROM, *Leviticus 1–16* (AncB 3; New York 1991) 478-479.

⁽¹⁸⁾ Mit LXX und 4QSam^a (בזולת שלשה השנים) ist MT (ובזולת שלשה השנים) zu korrigieren.

⁽¹⁹⁾ Vier Kochgefäße werden nur in MT spezifiziert. LXX listet demgegenüber drei Gefäße auf, 4QSam^a in der korrespondierenden Erweiterung von V. 16 (V. 14 ist in den Fragmenten der Handschrift nicht vorhanden) lediglich zwei, nämlich בפרור און בסיר. McCARTER, *I Samuel*, 79, hält den Text von 4QSam^a für die ursprüngliche Lesart “[i]n view of the strong tendency of lists to conflate”.

⁽²⁰⁾ Anhand des Vorschlags von ZWICKEL, *Räucher kult*, 171, gegen die Verseinteilung von MT בשלה zu V. 15 zu ziehen, kann das Aufeinanderprallen der beiden adverbialen Bestimmungen שם בשלה vermieden werden.

sagen sollte⁽²¹⁾: “Zuerst muß man das Fett verbrennen, und dann kannst du dir all das⁽²²⁾ nehmen, was dein Herz begehrt”, so antwortete er: “Nein⁽²³⁾, gib jetzt, sonst nehme ich (es) mit Gewalt!”¹⁷ So wurde die Sünde der Diener sehr groß vor JHWH, denn sie⁽²⁴⁾ verachteten die Opfergabe JHWHs.

Wenn nun der Abschnitt 1 Sam 2,13-14 als Beschreibung regulärer Kultpraktiken der zugrundeliegenden Epoche erkannt ist, kann er auf weiterführende Einzelheiten des Rituals hin befragt werden. Zunächst läßt sich eine Phase des Schlachtopfers wie folgt rekonstruieren:

Kochen der Fleischstücke in Töpfen — Fett verbrennen — Eintreiben des Priesteranteils mittels dreizackiger Gabel.

Allerdings stellt sich hier u. a. die Frage, wie das Tierfett abgesondert und verbrannt wird. Rost beispielsweise kommentiert das Schlachtopfer-Ritual wie folgt:

Dann häutet er [sc. der Opferherr] es [sc. das Opfertier] ab, öffnet den Bauch und nimmt die Fettstücke heraus und bringt sie zum Altar. ... [Sie werden] dort unter starker Rauchentwicklung verschmort (*qittēr*)⁽²⁵⁾.

Rost orientiert sich dabei jedoch maßgeblich am priesterlichen Opfergesetz in Lev 3, was sich etwa darin zeigt, dass er im Rahmen der Tierschlachtung die Handaufstimmung voraussetzt⁽²⁶⁾. Sollte 1 Sam 2,13-14 aber in der Tat ein Opfertarif aus der Frühgeschichte Israels sein, wovon hier ausgegangen wird, dann muß es durchaus als fragliches Unterfangen angesehen werden, den Ritualverlauf von den priesterlichen Ritualgesetzen her zu ergänzen.

Einen sehr originellen Vorschlag zum Modus der Fettverbrennung in 1 Sam 2,13-16 hat demgegenüber W. Zwickel unterbreitet, dessen Textauslegung sich auch auf die Auswertung archäologischer Erkenntnisse stützt. Zwickel weist darauf hin, dass sich beim Kochvorgang ein Teil des im Fleisch enthaltenen Fettes nach einiger Zeit auslöse und auf dem kochenden Wasser schwimme. Es könne dann abgeschöpft und als Räucheropfer auf einem Räucheraltar verbrannt werden⁽²⁷⁾. Von dieser Rekonstruktion der normalen Kultpraxis her läßt sich das Fehlverhalten von Elis Söhnen wie folgt beschreiben:

⁽²¹⁾ Zu dieser Rekonstruktion des Textes vgl. McCARTER, *I Samuel*, 79, demzufolge MT יִשְׁכַּח “inconsistent with the habitual tenses elsewhere” sei.

⁽²²⁾ Mit LXX und 4QSam^a (מִכֹּל אֲשֶׁר) ist MT (כָּאֲשֶׁר) zu korrigieren.

⁽²³⁾ Vgl. Qere אָל.

⁽²⁴⁾ Mit LXX und 4QSam^a ist אֲשֶׁר aus MT auszulassen; vgl. dazu u. a. D. BARTHÉLEMY, “La qualité du Texte Massorétique de Samuel”, *The Hebrew and Greek Texts of Samuel* (Hrsg. E. Tov) (Jerusalem 1980) 5.

⁽²⁵⁾ L. ROST, *Studien zum Opfer im Alten Israel* (BWANT 113; Stuttgart 1981) 89.

⁽²⁶⁾ A. a. O., 88.

⁽²⁷⁾ Vgl. ZWICKEL, *Räucher kult*, 174-175, 180; ders., *Der Tempelkult in Kanaan und Israel*. Studien zur Kultgeschichte Palästinas von der Mittelbronzezeit bis zum Untergang Judas (FAT 10; Tübingen 1994) 288; ders., *Die Welt des Alten und Neuen Testaments*. Ein Sach- und Arbeitsbuch (Stuttgart 1997) 74; ders., “Opfer”, *CBL* (noch unveröffentlicht).

Das Vergehen der Priester in Silo war, dass sie rohes Fleisch wollten, also Fleisch, das noch nicht ausgekocht war und somit den Fettanteil noch enthielt. Demnach beanspruchten sie den Jahwe gehörenden Teil — und dies wurde ihnen als Frevel ausgelegt⁽²⁸⁾.

Damit läßt sich die eben bestimmte Phase im Normalablauf des Schlachtopfers wie folgt konkretisieren:

Kochen der Fleischstücke in Töpfen, dabei *erstens* Abschöpfen und Verbrennen des Fettes auf dem Räucheraltar, *zweitens* Eintreiben des Priesteranteils mittels dreizackiger Gabel.

Aus den unpersönlichen Formulierungen in 1 Sam 2,16 (קָטַר יִקְטִירוֹן) geht allerdings nicht hervor, wessen Aufgabe das Verbrennen des Fettes ist⁽²⁹⁾. In diesem Zusammenhang schafft das bereits angesprochene Gerichtswort des Gottesmannes gegen das Priestergeschlecht Elis Klarheit (1 Sam 2,27-36). Hier wird eingangs die Berufung der Priester auch im Zeichen der Verbrennung beschrieben: Gott erwählte das Haus Elis, „um zu meinem Altar hinaufzusteigen (לַעֲלוֹת עַל־מִזְבֵּחַ), um das Räucheropfer zu verbrennen (לִדְהֹקֵי קָטַר), um das Ephod [vor mir] zu tragen“ (V. 28). Die durch die Wurzel קָטַר bezeichnete Verbrennung ist also Aufgabe der Priesterschaft und wird nicht vom Opfergeber durchgeführt, der jedoch für den Großteil der sonstigen rituellen Handlungen verantwortlich ist. Da die Fettverbrennung zum Normalablauf des Schlachtopfers gehört, ist auch zwingend die Intervention von Priestern bzw. die Durchführung des Opfers am Heiligtum, wo sich der Altar Gottes befindet, vorausgesetzt. Der Grund liegt darin, dass sich erst hier die eigentliche Kommunikation mit Gott ereignet. Diese ist ihrem Wesen nach die Darbringung des Tierfettes, das seinerseits im engeren Sinne „Gabe an JHWH“ (וְהָיָה דְּמִיָּהּ לַיהוָה [V. 17]) ist. Aufgrund dieser Aspekte kommt der Fettverbrennung auf dem Räucheraltar eine besondere kultische Bedeutung zu.

Die Bedeutung dieses Ritualaktes als Kommunikation mit Gott läßt sich ferner via negationis aus der Sünde der Elisöhne erheben. Ihr Fehlverhalten beschränkt sich zwar dem im Vorangegangenen dargestellten Verständnis zufolge auf die Forderung nach rohem Fleisch (V. 15-16). Weil aber auf diese Weise das Auskochen des Fettes unterbunden wird und damit dessen Darbringung auf dem Altar als kultisches Herzstück des Opferrituals, muß jede Regelwidrigkeit in diesem Bereich besonders schwer wiegen, denn sie trifft letztlich Gott selbst. Die Beurteilung der Schwere der Verfehlung in V. 17 (וְהָיָה דְּמִיָּהּ לַיהוָה נִדְוָלָה מִבֵּית יְהוָה) sowie die daraus resultierende Verwerfung von Elis Priestergeschlecht in V. 30 korrespondieren also mit der Bedeutung der Fettverbrennung und sind in ihr begründet.

Damit ergibt sich insgesamt ein differenziertes Bild von den unterschiedlichen Funktionen eines Schlachtopfers für die verschiedenen beteiligten Parteien. Die wichtigste Funktion ist natürlich das Mahl oder Fest, das es dem Opfergeber ermöglicht (vgl. dazu Elkanas Schlachtopfer in 1 Sam

⁽²⁸⁾ W. ZWICKEL, *Räucher kult*, 174; vgl. ders., „Zur Frühgeschichte des Brandopfers in Israel“, *Biblische Welten* (FS. M. Metzger; [Hrsg. W. ZWICKEL] OBO 123; Freiburg – Göttingen 1993) 236.

⁽²⁹⁾ Vgl. ROST, *Studien*, 86.

1,4-9.18-19). Aufgrund der anfallenden Priesteranteile ist es zweitens eine wichtige Nahrungsquelle für die Priesterfamilie. Die kultische Bedeutung dieses Opfers ist drittens in der Verbrennung des Fettes als Gabe für Gott begründet. Mit diesen drei begünstigten Parteien besitzt das Schlachtopfer sein ganz individuelles Profil.

2. Das Gemeinschafts-Schlachtopfer nach Lev 3

Die Verbrennung des Tierfettes ist bei der Untersuchung von 1 Sam 2,12-17 als kultisch höchst bedeutende Ritualhandlung im Rahmen des Schlachtopfers bestimmt worden. Das mag insofern überraschen, als gerade diesem Akt meist nur wenig Beachtung bei der Interpretation von Opfern geschenkt wird⁽³⁰⁾. Es kann jedoch gezeigt werden, dass beispielsweise auch in Lev 3, dem wichtigsten alt. Texten über das Gemeinschafts-Schlachtopfer (זֶבַח שְׁלָמִים)⁽³¹⁾, durchaus ähnliche Merkmale feststellbar sind. Das ist umso bemerkenswerter, als zwischen beiden Texten zunächst die Unterschiede im Vordergrund stehen. Denn Lev 3 ist ein Ritualgesetz und gehört damit einem anderen Genre an als 1 Sam 2,12-17. Beide Texte entstammen zweitens auch verschiedenen Epochen⁽³²⁾. Drittens können Schlachtopfer und

⁽³⁰⁾ J. MILGROM, *Leviticus*, 222-223, beispielsweise hält den Blutritus für das wichtigste Ritualelement beim Gemeinschafts-Schlachtopfer. Ein Versuch, die Verbrennung des Fettes auf dem Brandopferaltar (Lev 3,5.11.16) zu deuten, wird allerdings nicht unternommen (vgl. a. a. O., 208-209, 213-214, 221). Ähnlich ist der Befund bei der Interpretation der atl. Opfer allgemein. In einem diesbezüglichen Wörterbuch-Artikel nennt J. MILGROM, "Sacrifices and Offerings, OT.", *IDB.Sup* (Nashville 1982) 766, die Verbrennung zwar als Ritualelement, verzichtet aber auf jegliche weiterführende Deutung. Und für G. VON RAD, *Theologie des Alten Testaments* (München 1987), I, 275, beschränkt sich die "Klärung des für die Priesterschrift vornehmlichen Zweckes der Opferdarbringung ... [auf die] ... Sühnung. Ohne Frage erleichtert es das Problem, dass sich die Frage auf die Auflichtung eines einzigen Begriffes zuspitzt, nämlich זָכַר". Anhand eines solchen Ansatzes muß eine angemessene Würdigung des Verbrennungsaktes von vornherein unterbleiben.

⁽³¹⁾ Die Übersetzung der Doppelbezeichnung זֶבַח שְׁלָמִים ist wegen des großen Bedeutungsspektrums der Wurzel שָׁלַם und den verschiedenen Möglichkeiten der verbalen bzw. nominalen Derivation von שְׁלָמִים sowie aufgrund variierender Erklärungen der Pluralform nach wie vor strittig. Anstelle einer erschöpfenden Klärung sei hier auf die ausführlichen Darstellungen bei R. RENDTORFF, *Leviticus* (BK.AT 3; Neukirchen-Vluyn 1985) 124-127, und T. SEIDL, "שְׁלָמִים, *šlāmîm*", *ThWAT* 8 (1995) 102, verwiesen. Die hier gewählte Wiedergabe von זֶבַח שְׁלָמִים mit "Gemeinschafts-Schlachtopfer" gründet sich weniger auf etymologische Erwägungen. Sie orientiert sich vielmehr am rituellen Erscheinungsbild der שְׁלָמִים-Opfer, die primär bei öffentlichen Anlässen dargebracht werden (z. B. Ex 20,24; Dtn 27,5-7; 1 Kön 9,25 bei Errichtung und Einweihung von Altären; 1 Sam 10,8; 13,9 im Zusammenhang mit Sauls Königtum; 2 Sam 6,17 bei Davids Überführung der Bundeslade nach Jerusalem), während ein זֶבַח eher auf den privaten Bereich beschränkt ist (Gen 31,54; 46,1; 1 Sam 1,3-17; 9,12-24; vgl. dazu auch RENDTORFF, *Leviticus*, 120-122). Diese Wiedergabe impliziert folglich nicht, dass es im Zusammenhang des für den זֶבַח שְׁלָמִים charakteristischen Opfermahles zu einer vermeintlichen mystischen Gemeinschaft der Mahlteilnehmer mit Gott komme. Für eine solche Vorstellung existieren im AT keine Anhaltspunkte vgl. A. DEISSLER, "Das Opfer im Alten Testament", *Das Opfer Jesu Christi und seine Gegenwart in der Kirche*. Klärungen zum Opfercharakter des Herrenmahles (Hrsg. K. LEHMANN – E. SCHLINK) (DiKi 3; Freiburg 1983) 24; WILLI-PLEIN, *Opfer und Kult*, 66; R. RENDTORFF, *Theologie des Alten Testaments*. Ein kanonischer Entwurf (Neukirchen-Vluyn 1999), I, 54.

⁽³²⁾ Die Opferritualgesetze werden als Bestandteil der sog. Priesterschrift heute meist in die exilisch-nachexilische Zeit datiert; vgl. etwa WILLI-PLEIN, *Opfer und Kult*, 91; zum

Gemeinschafts-Schlachtopfer trotz gewisser Gemeinsamkeiten nicht von vornherein miteinander identifiziert werden⁽³³⁾. Dass aber trotz dieser Unterschiede die anhand von 1 Sam 2,12-17 beobachtete Bedeutung der Fettverbrennung auch im priesterlichen Ritualgesetz des Gemeinschafts-Schlachtopfers greifbar ist, soll im Folgenden gezeigt werden. Nach Lev 3 umfaßt das Ritual des Gemeinschafts-Schlachtopfers folgende Akte:

Handaufstimmung – Schächten des Opfertieres – Ausgießen des Blutes am Brandopferaltar – Abtrennen der Fettanteile – Verbrennung der Fettanteile auf dem Brandopferaltar.

In Lev 3 werden die Fettanteile, die auf dem Brandopferaltar zu verbrennen sind, in den drei Ritualanweisungen für Rind (V. 1-5), Schaf (V. 7-11) und Ziege (V. 12-16) jeweils genau bezeichnet (V. 3b-4.9aß-10.14b-15). Damit ist notwendigerweise eine andere Art der Herauslösung dieser Partien impliziert, als das gemäß der älteren Praxis in 1 Sam 2,12-17 vermutlich mittels Auskochen geschah. Speziell der mit קֶמֶר Hif. (Lev 3,5.11.16) bezeichnete, letzte Akt des Rituals impliziert eine Verbrennung im offenen Holzfeuer, da dieser Akt konkret “auf dem Brandopfer⁽³⁴⁾,

Überblick T. STAUBLI, *Die Bücher Leviticus, Numeri* (NSK.AT 3; Stuttgart 1996) 25-29. Dem steht der Ansatz Kaufmanns gegenüber, der von dem hohen Alter dieser Texte ausgeht (vgl. z. B. Y. KAUFMANN, “Der Kalender und das Alter des Priesterkodex”, VT 4 [1954] 307-313). Kaufmanns Alternative wird heute u.a. von Milgrom vertreten (vgl. J. MILGROM, “Introduction. On the Dating of P and Related Cultic Issues”, ders., *Studies in Cultic Theology and Terminology* [SJLA 36; Leiden 1983] ix-xiii; ders., *Numbers. The Traditional Hebrew Text with the New JPS Translation* [JPS Torah Commentary; Philadelphia 1990] xxxii-xxxv; ders., *Leviticus*, 3-13). Einen Kompromiß zwischen diesen gegensätzlichen Datierungen vertritt RENDTORFF, *Leviticus*, 6, dem zufolge wenigstens in den priesterlichen Pentateuchtexten “Elemente einer relativ alten Kultpraxis enthalten sind”, obwohl er davon ausgeht, dass sie laufend an die aktuellen Opferrituale angeglichen wurden und deshalb “die jetzt vorliegende Fassung der Texte im wesentlichen die kultische Praxis im nachexilischen Tempel widerspiegelt” (ebd.; vgl. ferner E.S. GERSTENBERGER, *Das dritte Buch Mose. Leviticus* [ATD 6; Göttingen 1993] 3-4). Bei aller Unsicherheit hinsichtlich der Datierung der priesterlichen Pentateuchtexte sind diese jedoch im Vergleich mit der in 1 Sam 2,12-17 greifbaren Kultpraxis als jünger einzuschätzen (so z. B. auch STOLZ, *Samuel*, 32).

⁽³³⁾ Der Unterschied zwischen Schlachtopfer und שלמים-Opfer wurde bereits oben in Fußnote 31 thematisiert. Für das in den priesterlichen Texten anzutreffende Gemeinschafts-Schlachtopfer ist von einer Nivellierung der individuellen Profile von Schlachtopfer und שלמים-Opfer auszugehen. Exemplarisch sei auf Lev 17 hingewiesen, wo שלמים (V. 4 LXX und nach Samaritanischem Pentateuch), זֶבַח (V. 5.7.8) und זֶבַח שלמים (V. 5) offenbar synonym verwendet werden.

⁽³⁴⁾ Vgl. RENDTORFF, *Leviticus*, 115: “über dem Brandopfer” (vgl. 131-132). MILGROM, *Leviticus*, 208-209, und B.A. LEVINE, *Leviticus. The Traditional Hebrew Text with the New JPS Translation* [JPS Torah Commentary; Philadelphia 1990] 16, übersetzen “with the burnt offering”. Diese Formulierung setzt zunächst voraus, dass vor dem Gemeinschafts-Schlachtopfer schon ein anderes Opfer stattgefunden hat. In der Tat zeigt ein Blick auf größere Opferfeste, dass diese Opferart meist auf ein Brandopfer folgt (z. B. Lev 9,12-14.18; 2 Chr 29,27-28.31-35). Doch auch abseits solcher Feste ist das erste Opfer des Tages stets das “tägliche Brandopfer” (עֹלֶת הַיּוֹם), auf das alle weiteren Opfer folgen. Wird dieser Ablauf berücksichtigt, dann ist deutlich, dass die Anteile des Gemeinschafts-Schlachtopfers konkret auf den Resten des inzwischen vom Altarfeuer schon teilweise verzehrten Brandopfers aufgeschichtet werden.

das sich auf dem Holz auf dem Feuer auf dem Altar befindet“ (Lev 3,5) [על־העֹלָה אֲשֶׁר עַל־הַעֲצִים אֲשֶׁר עַל־הָאֵשׁ אֲשֶׁר עַל־הַמִּזְבֵּחַ] ⁽³⁵⁾, geschieht. Durch diese Vorschrift erfährt die Verbrennung schon eine gewisse Betonung, da sie auf dem Brandopferaltar, also der zentralen, hochheiligen Kultinstallation in der Mitte des Tempelvorhofes, stattfindet. Zweitens wird dieser Akt mit verschiedenen interpretierenden Begriffen konnotiert: Einerseits “bringt er [sc. der Opfernde] vom Gemeinschafts-Schlachtopfer eine Feuergabe für JHWH dar” (וְהִקְרִיב מִזְבַּח הַשְּׁלָמִים אֵשָׁה לַיהוָה [V. 3a.9a; vgl. V. 14a]). An die nun folgende Aufzählung der Fett-Teile und die Anweisung zur Verbrennung schließen sich jeweils sogar zwei oder mehr interpretierende Begriffe an: Stets erscheint der Terminus “Feuergabe” (אֵשָׁה [V. 5b.11b.16b]), der folglich wiederholt wird und den Akt der Verbrennung rahmt; zweimal erscheinen darüber hinaus die Begriffe “Wohlgeruch” (רִיחַ נִיחֹחַ [V. 5b.16b]) und “Speise” (לֶחֶם [V. 11b.16b]). Zu diesen drei verschiedenen interpretierenden Termini tritt als letztes Wort der drei Ritualanweisungen jeweils die Designation “für JHWH”. Sie korrespondiert mit dem Begriff “Gabe für JHWH” (קָרְבַּן לַיהוָה), der die Opfergesetze in Lev 1–7 gleichsam rahmend umgibt (1,2; 7,38) und außerdem in den einzelnen Ritualvorschriften explizit auf jede der fünf kultischen Opferarten angewendet wird (vgl. dazu auch das häufige Vorkommen des zugehörigen Verbes קָרַב Hif.). Für das Gemeinschafts-Schlachtopfer ist damit deutlich, dass seine besondere Qualität als “Gabe für JHWH” im Ritualelement der Verbrennung auf dem Brandopferaltar begründet ist. Drittens sei darauf hingewiesen, dass die Aufzählung der zur Verbrennung bestimmten Fett-Teile sowie die Anweisung über diesen letzten Ritualakt weit mehr als die Hälfte der gesamten Opfervorschrift ausmachen ⁽³⁶⁾. Anhand dieser drei Aspekte ist die Schlußfolgerung unumgänglich, dass der Verbrennung auf dem Brandopferaltar auch in den priesterlichen Ritualvorschriften über das Gemeinschafts-Schlachtopfer eine besondere kultische Bedeutung zukommt.

Diesen Beobachtungen zufolge ist die Verbrennung auf dem Brandopferaltar kultisch ebenso bedeutend wie in dem älteren, vorangehend analysierten Text 1 Sam 2,12-17 über das Schlachtopfer. Insbesondere begründet dieser Ritualakt in beiden Texten die Qualität des jeweiligen Opfers als Gabe für Gott (מִנְחַת יְהוָה [1 Sam 2,17]; קָרְבַּן [Lev 3,1]). In den priesterlichen Opfervorschriften sind darüber hinaus aber auch die weiteren Funktionen, die im Vorangehenden für das Schlachtopfer benannt worden sind, greifbar, nämlich die Versorgung einerseits des Opfergebers mit Fleisch im Rahmen des Opfermahles sowie andererseits der Priester durch die vorgeschriebenen Abgaben. So stellt das Verbot des Fett- und Blutgenusses in

⁽³⁵⁾ Mit LXX und Samaritanischem Pentateuch sind in MT die Worte אֲשֶׁר עַל־הַמִּזְבֵּחַ zu ergänzen.

⁽³⁶⁾ Konkret umfaßt die Ritualvorschrift des זֶבַח שְׁלָמִים vom Rind (V. 1-5) 85 Worte (hier und nachfolgend unter Zugrundelegung des MT), von denen 50 Worte auf die Aufzählung der Fettstücke und die Anweisung zur Verbrennung entfallen (V. 3-5). Das Ritual vom Schaf (V. 7-11) besteht aus 74 Worten, von denen 45 Worte auf die Aufzählung der Fettstücke und die Anweisung zur Verbrennung entfallen (V. 9-11). Das Ritual von der Ziege (V. 12-16) zählt 67 Worte, von denen 43 auf die Aufzählung der Fettstücke und die Anweisung zur Verbrennung entfallen (V. 14-16).

Lev 3,17 (כל־הלב וכל־דם לא תאכלו) bereits einen Ausblick auf das Opfermahl dar. Dieses Mahl folgt zwar in der Regel auf die Verbrennung der Fettanteile des Gemeinschafts-Schlachtopfers, ist allerdings in Lev 3 noch nicht angesprochen, da hier allein der Opferverlauf am Heiligtum beschrieben wird. Es ist dann aber Gegenstand der Tora über das Gemeinschafts-Schlachtopfer (זֶבַח שְׁלָמִים [Lev 7,11-13]), in welcher die diversen Zugaben zum Opfer, die Verzehrfristen und die zum Verzehr berechtigten Personen thematisiert werden. Hier wird das Fett- und Blutgenußverbot wiederholt (V. 22-27) und im übrigen ersteres mit Verweis auf die "Feuergabe für JHWH" (אֵשׁ לַיהוָה [V. 25]) begründet. Des weiteren werden in diesem Abschnitt auch die Priesteranteile spezifiziert (V. 28-34): von jedem Gemeinschafts-Schlachtopfer fallen den Priestern Brust und rechte Keule zu. Auch in den priesterlichen Opfergesetzen zum Gemeinschafts-Schlachtopfer sind also drei begünstigte Parteien bekannt, wodurch dieses Opfer im Vergleich mit den übrigen vier kultischen Opferarten von Lev 1–7 ebenso ein ganz individuelles Profil besitzt.

Emil-Moersch-Str. 3
D-72116 Moessingen

Christian EBERHART

SUMMARY

Following an alternative interpretation of 1 Sam 2,13-14, this text depicts the legitimate procedure for claiming the priest's portion of a sacrifice (זֶבַח). In particular, this method ensured that the fat could be offered to JHWH by turning it into smoke before any human being received his share. It was, however, violated by the sons of Eli who demanded meat with the fat still in it (V. 15-16). The fact that this violation was considered a great sin, resulting in Eli's priesthood being revoked, underscores the supreme importance of burning God's share. Similar features can be observed in the priestly laws about offerings: Concerning the communion sacrifice (זֶבַח שְׁלָמִים) in Lev 3, the description of turning the fat into smoke comprises more than half of the ritual text. This ritual element is, furthermore, accompanied by three different terms explicating its significance. It is also the only action to be carried out on the most sacred altar of burnt offerings. Finally, it is the burning of the fat which establishes the sacrificial nature of the entire ritual in 1 Sam 2,12-17 and Lev 3. Consequently, both the sacrifice and the communion sacrifice are considered an "offering for JHWH".

Samson the ‘Holy One’: A Suggestion Regarding the Reviser’s Use of ἅγιος in Judg 13,7; 16,17 LXX Vaticanus

Scholars have long noted and wrestled with the lexical disparities between the two prominent LXX MS families — Codex Alexandrinus (LXX^A) and Codex Vaticanus (LXX^B). One such lexical oddity that has drawn particular attention over the last several decades, especially amongst New Testament scholars⁽¹⁾, is the reference to the figure Samson in Judg 13,7 and 16,17 of LXX^B. LXX^A and the Masoretic Text (MT) both refer to Samson simply by the designation ‘Nazirite’ in Judg 13,5,7 and 16,17 (ναζιρᾱος — LXX^A; נזיר — MT). In contrast, LXX^B, while using a form of the Greek transliteration in 13,5 (ναζιρ), surprisingly substitutes ἅγιος, ‘holy one’, for the religious technical term in 13,7 and 16,17. When recalling the instructions given her by the angel of the Lord, Samson’s mother in LXX^B 13,7 reiterates, ‘and now drink no wine or strong drink and eat nothing unclean, for the boy will be a holy one (ἅγιον) of God from the womb until the day of his death’. Similarly, Samson himself, when divulging the secret of his power to the Philistine harlot in 16,17, declares, ‘no razor has come upon my head, for I am a holy one (ἅγιος) of God’.

Though the presence of the peculiar title applied to Samson in LXX^B Judg has been well noted, relatively few have suggested a possible origin for the reading. With respect to the significant lexical disparity between the two terms, on what basis did the original author of the reading deem ἅγιος a suitable rendering of the religious technical term נזיר? The purpose of this article is to briefly address this issue and provide one possible solution to the aforesaid question. In short, I suggest the answer lies in an influence exerted on the reviser of LXX^B by the legislation for the Nazirite vow as stated in Num 6,5,8 — ‘all the days of his separation he shall be holy’.

Of the general relationship between the two MS families of LXX Judg, it can be said that they represent either preserved revisions of one another or separate revisions of a common Greek text now lost, rather than separate competing translations⁽²⁾. In terms of their respective dates the recent works of Bodine have substantiated the theory of Barthélemy that LXX^B Judg represents, in general, part of the early κείρε recension dating back to the turn

⁽¹⁾ See for instance the bibliography on the topic of ναζιρᾱος in Matt 2,23 in the recent commentary by W. D. DAVIES – D.C. ALLISON, *The Gospel according to Saint Matthew. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary* (ICC; Edinburgh 1988-1997) II, 283-284. A majority of scholars make a connection between Matt 2,23 and LXX^B Judg 13,7; 16,17.

⁽²⁾ N. FERNÁNDEZ MARCOS, *The Septuagint in Context. Introduction to the Greek Versions of the Bible* (Leiden 2000) 102-103; that LXX^A represents a later revision of the reading represented by LXX^B may be witnessed in at least two respects from the passages at hand. First, in 13,7 and 16,17 LXX^A conforms its reading more to MT by its consistent use of the Greek transliteration ναζιρᾱος where MT reads נזיר. Secondly, its unparalleled use of ἅγιος in 13,5, ‘the boy will be (ἡγιασμένον ναζιρᾱον) sanctified a Nazirite to God’, appears to be a retention on the part of LXX^A of the holiness concept so prominent in LXX^B.

of the era. LXX^A, on the other hand, represents a much later version similar in character to Origen's Hexaplaric recension of the third century AD⁽³⁾. An early date respecting the reading in LXX^B is suggested by its probable use in the Synoptic Gospels. Matthew and Mark, for instance, both create a play-on-words based on the LXX^B version of Samson when referring to the various titles of Jesus, e.g. 'Nazarene' (Matt 2,23) and 'Holy One of God' (Mark 1,18)⁽⁴⁾. Luke also seems to create a peculiar play on the reference when recording the annunciation of John the Baptist's birth, 'he will be filled with the holy spirit from the womb' (Luke 1,15).

One possibility for the reading in LXX^B 13,5,7 and 16,17 is the use of a Hebrew Vorlage other than MT. Against this, among available Hebrew MSS we have none that agree with LXX^B on these points. Further, there is no agreement between LXX^B and the other extant versions that would suggest the availability of a competing Hebrew reading. Some other solution, therefore, must account for the odd rendering.

Two partial solutions have been offered by Pretzl and more recently, Zuckschwerdt. According to Pretzl, the reviser introduced *ναζιρ* in 13,5 but then replaced it with a more familiar and intelligible term, *ἅγιος*, in 13,7 and 16,17⁽⁵⁾. Zuckschwerdt, on the other hand, suggests an influence of the practice of *Kethib-Qere*, wherein the reviser followed in one instance (13,5) what was written in his Vorlage, but in 13,7 and 16,17 in Greek what was normally read in its place — *שקד* = *ἅγιος*⁽⁶⁾. Pretzl's hypothesis is the more likely of the two, for it is doubtful the practice of the sixth-century AD Masoretes was active at the time our reading was composed⁽⁷⁾. Furthermore, if there was such a *Kethib-Qere* rendering for *נזיר* it certainly fell out of practice, as there is no trace of it where one might expect to find it, in either the Masora or the rabbinic targum tradition. Neither of these hypotheses provides an adequate answer to the question at hand.

A solution may be found in Num 6,5,8. Within the Judg narrative only one proscription is assigned to Samson, the cutting of his hair. Abstinence from wine, strong drink and unclean food is assigned to his mother, but for Samson specifically, only the prohibition against the use of a razor is mentioned (13,5,7; 16,17). Interestingly, it is in the context of the proscription against cutting the hair that the legislation for the Nazirite vow in Num 6,1-21 describes the Nazirite as holy. Num 6,5 states, 'all the days of his separation no razor shall come upon his head, ... he shall be holy (*ἅγιος ἔσται* — LXX; *שקד ייהיה* — MT), allowing his hair to grow long'. Similarly, in Num

(3) FERNÁNDEZ MARCOS, *Septuagint*, 94-96; W.R. BODINE, *The Greek Text of Judges. Recensional Developments* (HSM 23; Chico 1980). See his conclusions regarding Barthélemy's theory of the Vaticanus Greek text of Judg and the *καίγε* recension, 185-186; See also W.R. BODINE, "Kaije and Other Recensional Developments in the Greek Text of Judg", *BIOSCS* 13 (1980) 45-57.

(4) See n. 1 above.

(5) O. PRETZL, "Septuagintprobleme im Buch der Richter", *Bib* 7 (1926) 374-375.

(6) E. ZUCKSCHWERT, "Nazōraios in Matth. 2, 23", *TZ* 31 (1975) 71-77.

(7) See the response by H.M. ORLINSKY, "Problems of Kethib-Qere", *JAOS* 60 (1940) 30-45, to the monograph by R. GORDIS, *The Biblical Text in the Making. A Study of the Kethib-Qere* (Philadelphia 1937); See also H.M. ORLINSKY, "The Origin of the Kethib-Qere System: A New Approach", *VT* 7 (1959) 184-192.

6,8 the mandate to be holy is reiterated in the context of the proscription against contacting a corpse. As indicated by vv. 9-12, it is the hair that forms the basis of the Nazirite’s holiness and reason for abstinence from corpse impurity. If a dead body is accidentally contacted it is the hair that becomes defiled, shaved after a seven-day rite of purification (v. 9), and re-consecrated (ἁγιάσει — LXX; שָׁקַד — MT) along with the Nazirite’s avowed number of days (vv. 11-12). Based on such contextual similarity, what may lie behind the reviser’s alternating use of ἁγίος and ἁγιος, two lexically unrelated terms, for נָזִיר — is an influence of the law for the Nazirite to abstain from the use of a razor on the one hand, and the related law for the Nazirite to be holy because of his sanctified hair on the other. Our translator simply followed the association made between the terms נָזִיר and שָׁקַד already present in Num 6,5.8 and utilised the two terms interchangeably in his translation in Judg 13,5.7 and 16,17.

17A Edith Rd.
Oxford OX1 4QB (UK)

Stuart D. CHEPEY

SUMMARY

While the use of the Greek term ἁγιος, ‘holy one’, as a reference to Samson and rendering of the Hebrew religious technical term נָזִיר, ‘Nazirite’, in LXX^B Judg 13,7 and 16,17 seems odd given their lexical disparity, an association between the terms does occur in the law for the Nazirite to be holy respecting the growth of hair in Num 6,5.8. A contextual similarity between the Numbers passage and Judg 13,5.7 and 16,17 occurs in that Samson is accorded only one proscription — the use of a razor upon his head. It is likely therefore, perhaps as a way of introducing a new and unintelligible term, that the reviser of LXX^B Judg followed the word association made in Num 6,5.8 and used the two terms, ἁγιος in 13,5 and ἁγιος in 13,7 and 16,17, interchangeably in his version of the Samson story.

Son of God in Roman Imperial Titles and Matthew

In two articles published in this journal, Tae Hun Kim and Earl S. Johnson, Jr., have debated the legitimacy of interpreting the anarthrous formula $\nu\acute{\iota}\omicron\varsigma$ $\theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$ in Mark 15,39 in light of the Roman imperial formula $\theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$ $\nu\acute{\iota}\omicron\varsigma$ ⁽¹⁾. Moving beyond this debate, we will argue (1) that this Roman imperial formula exactly parallels the distinctive christological formula in three *Matthean* passages (14,33; 27,43.54), (2) that this Roman formula occurred much more widely in first century imperial titlature than Kim and Johnson have indicated, (3) that various three-word Roman son of god formulas also deserve notice, and (4) that the Matthean formula $\theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$ $\nu\acute{\iota}\omicron\varsigma$ would have evoked Roman imperial usage for at least some members of Matthew's community.

This article contains four sections. The first section demonstrates the uniqueness of the Matthean formula $\theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$ $\nu\acute{\iota}\omicron\varsigma$ within the NT, while the second section surveys the son of god formulas in first century Roman imperial titlature, especially the titlature in Greek inscriptions and other sources from the eastern portion of the empire. The third section asks how members of Matthew's community could have encountered these Roman son of god formulas, while the final section argues that the Matthean $\theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$ $\nu\acute{\iota}\omicron\varsigma$ would have evoked this Roman imperial usage for at least some members of Matthew's community.

1. Son of God Formulas in the NT

The NT contains five Son of God formulas which have only the governing noun $\nu\acute{\iota}\omicron\varsigma$, the genitive noun $\theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$, and perhaps one or two definite articles. These five formulas are (1) $\acute{\omicron}$ $\nu\acute{\iota}\omicron\varsigma$ $\tau\omicron\upsilon$ $\theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$, (2) $\nu\acute{\iota}\omicron\varsigma$ $\tau\omicron\upsilon$ $\theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$, (3) $\acute{\omicron}$ $\tau\omicron\upsilon$ $\theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$ $\nu\acute{\iota}\omicron\varsigma$, (4) $\nu\acute{\iota}\omicron\varsigma$ $\theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$, and (5) $\theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$ $\nu\acute{\iota}\omicron\varsigma$. The first formula is the most common, for it appears in all four of the canonical gospels plus Acts, Galatians, Ephesians, Hebrews, 1 John, and Revelation ⁽²⁾. Note that definite articles precede both of the nouns in this formula. The second formula consists of an anarthrous $\nu\acute{\iota}\omicron\varsigma$ followed by the articular genitive $\tau\omicron\upsilon$ $\theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$. In each NT occurrence of this formula, the anarthrous $\nu\acute{\iota}\omicron\varsigma$ is either in the nominative case in the predicate ⁽³⁾ or in the vocative case ⁽⁴⁾. The third formula, which appears only in 2 Cor 1,19, has the genitive $\tau\omicron\upsilon$ $\theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$

⁽¹⁾ T.H. KIM, "The Anarthrous $\nu\acute{\iota}\omicron\varsigma$ $\theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$ in Mark 15,39 and the Roman Imperial Cult", *Bib* 79 (1998) 221-241; E.S. JOHNSON, JR., "Mark 15,39 and the So-Called Confession of the Roman Centurion", *Bib* 81 (2000) 406-413. For recent attempts to interpret aspects of the canonical gospels in light of the Roman imperial background, see JOHNSON, "Mark 15,39", 406, n. 2.

⁽²⁾ Matt 26,63; Mark 3,11; Luke 4,41; 22,70; John 1,34.49; 5,25; 11,4.27; 20,31; Acts 9,20; Gal 2,20; Eph 4,13; Heb 4,14; 6,6; 7,3; 10,29; 1 John 3,8; 4,15; 5,5.10.12.13.20; Rev 2,18. Cf. also Matt 16,16; John 3,18.

⁽³⁾ Matt 4,3.6; 27,40; Luke 4,3.9; John 10,36.

⁽⁴⁾ Matt 8,29. Cf. Mark 5,7; Luke 8,28.

embedded in the words ὁ ... υἱός. Paul may have pulled the genitive forward in this (*ad hoc*?) construction because he had used the noun θεός in the preceding verse, 2 Cor 1,18⁽⁵⁾.

The fourth and the fifth formulas have only anarthrous nouns. While the fourth formula (υἱὸς θεοῦ) occurs relatively infrequently in the NT, it occurs in a series of widely-scattered passages, including the centurion's 'confession' in Mark 15,39, the angel's proclamation in Luke 1,35, the words of Jesus' accusers in John 19,7, the traditional material in Rom 1,4, and the textually uncertain words in Mark 1,1. Despite the absence of definite articles, this formula agrees with most other NT references to the Son of God in placing the noun υἱός before the genitive θεοῦ⁽⁶⁾.

The fifth formula (θεοῦ υἱός), which has a *prepositive* genitive θεοῦ, occurs in the NT in only three passages, all of them in Matthew (14,33; 27,43.54). Before arguing that this formula would have evoked Roman imperial usage for some members of Matthew's community, we must examine the use of this formula in Roman imperial titulature.

2. Son of God in Roman Imperial Titulature

When surveying the son of god formulas in Roman imperial titulature, we will focus on Greek inscriptions and other Greek sources from the eastern part of the empire, since the First Gospel was presumably composed in Greek in this part of the empire⁽⁷⁾. We will survey the son of god formulas in the titulature of first century emperors from Augustus to Domitian; however, we will delay the consideration of the imperial cult until Section 3.

Julius Caesar's will named Octavian as his adopted son and heir. After the deceased Julius was consecrated a *divus*⁽⁸⁾, Octavian began to call himself *divi filius* ('son of a divinized man'). Note that he chose *divi filius* rather than *dei filius*; however, since both phrases were usually translated into Greek as θεοῦ υἱός, the Latin distinction was lost in translation⁽⁹⁾. Many provincials who read inscriptions containing this Greek phrase must have assumed that Octavian, who received the title Augustus in 27 BCE, was being honored as 'son of (a) god'. Indeed, various eastern sources hail his adoptive father Julius as θεός⁽¹⁰⁾.

Although the phrase θεοῦ Ἰουλίου υἱός appears in a few sources which refer to Augustus, especially sources from the early years of his reign⁽¹¹⁾, the two-word formula θεοῦ υἱός became much more common. This two-word formula appears in various longer formulas, including the five-word formula

⁽⁵⁾ Commentators are curiously silent concerning the uniqueness of this formula within the NT.

⁽⁶⁾ This wording also occurs in Wis 2,18, and the same word order occurs in 4Q246, the 'son of God' text from Qumran.

⁽⁷⁾ For an overview regarding these issues, see W.D. DAVIES – D.C. ALLISON, Jr., *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to Saint Matthew* (ICC; Edinburgh 1988-1997) I, 7-9, 72-85, 138-147.

⁽⁸⁾ S. WEINSTOCK, *Divus Julius* (Oxford 1971) 364-410.

⁽⁹⁾ For reflections on this problem, see S.R.F. PRICE, "Gods and Emperors: The Greek Language of the Roman Imperial Cult", *JHS* 104 (1984) 79-95.

⁽¹⁰⁾ *IGRR* IV 7, 1718; *SEG* XXXVII 1007.

⁽¹¹⁾ *SIG* III 768; *SEG* XXXII 833, 1128.

αὐτοκράτωρ Καῖσαρ θεοῦ υἱὸς Σεβαστός which became common after Octavian received the title Augustus (translated as Σεβαστός)⁽¹²⁾ and various longer formulas which became common during the final years of his rule⁽¹³⁾.

Augustus was honored as a god in the East during his reign, and some Greek texts hail him as both θεός and θεοῦ υἱός⁽¹⁴⁾. He was formally designated a *divus* in Rome after his death. His successor and adopted son Tiberius could therefore call himself ‘son of god Sebastos’.

Tiberius, who reigned during 14-37 CE, was the emperor during the ministries of John the Baptist and Jesus (Luke 3,1). He is identified as θεοῦ Σεβαστοῦ υἱός by various inscriptions and coins⁽¹⁵⁾, and he is called θεοῦ υἱός by inscriptions located in such widely-scattered regions as Egypt, Achaia, Asia, Cilicia, and even the northern shore of the Black Sea⁽¹⁶⁾. Tiberius is called a god by various Greek inscriptions and coins⁽¹⁷⁾, and he is hailed as both ‘god’ and ‘son of god Sebastos’ by a few Greek sources⁽¹⁸⁾. Early Christians who heard about these imperial honors may not have known that Tiberius was never officially declared a *divus* by the Roman Senate.

Gaius Caligula’s principate (37-41 CE) was brief and tumultuous. He was Tiberius’ adopted grandson and heir⁽¹⁹⁾, and a letter from the first year of his reign identifies him as ‘grandson of Tiberius Caesar’ and ‘descendant of god Sebastos’ (θεοῦ Σεβαστοῦ ἔγγονος)⁽²⁰⁾. Note that this letter recognizes Sebastos (Augustus) as a god but withholds this honor from Tiberius. While Gaius apparently never used the formula θεοῦ υἱός, he demanded divine honors in the East and perhaps even in Rome⁽²¹⁾. But he was assassinated, and no successor claimed to be a son of the god Gaius.

Claudius, who reigned during 41-54 CE, did not claim to be the son of a god. He was the son of Drusus, and various inscriptions call him simply Δρούσου υἱός⁽²²⁾. But he was acclaimed a god in the East during his

⁽¹²⁾ IGRR I 1109; IV 310; SEG XXXV 1256; R.K. SHERK, *Roman Documents from the Greek East* (Baltimore 1969) no. 61.

⁽¹³⁾ IGRR I 853; III 137; SEG XXXIX 1210; W.H. BUCKLER, “Auguste, Zeus Patroos”, *RPh* 9 (1935) 177-188; V. EHRENBURG – A.H.M. JONES, *Documents Illustrating the Reigns of Augustus and Tiberius* (Oxford 1976) no. 99.

⁽¹⁴⁾ IGRR I 853; SIG III 778; SEG XXXIX 752.

⁽¹⁵⁾ IGRR I 1164, 1166; IV 207, 1042; SEG XXVIII 1205; A. BURNETT – M. AMANDRY – P. RIPOLLÈS, *Roman Provincial Coinage* (London – Paris 1992-) I, 3620, 4006.

⁽¹⁶⁾ IGRR I 853, 1150; III 845; IV 1288; SIG III 791A; SB 8317; SEG XXXVII 484. Since KIM, “Anarthrous”, 233, was aware of only one of these inscriptions, he erroneously viewed it as an exception.

⁽¹⁷⁾ IGRR III 715; IV 144; SEG XXXVI 1092; BURNETT et al., *Roman Provincial Coinage*, I, 2344-2346.

⁽¹⁸⁾ IGRR I 659; III 933 = EHRENBURG – JONES, *Documents*, no. 134. Cf. IGRR III 721.

⁽¹⁹⁾ Augustus forced Tiberius to adopt Gaius’ father Germanicus. Though Tiberius designated Gaius and Gemellus as his joint-heirs, the Senate deprived Gemellus of his share.

⁽²⁰⁾ IG VII 2711 = M. SMALLWOOD, *Documents Illustrating the Principates of Gaius, Claudius and Nero* (London 1967) no. 361.

⁽²¹⁾ A.A. BARRETT, *Caligula. The Corruption of Power* (New Haven – London 1990) 143-153. A damaged Attic fragment apparently called Gaius Ἀρη[ος] υἱόν (CIA III 444a), though this reading is not certain.

⁽²²⁾ IGRR III 768 = M.P. CHARLESWORTH, *Documents Illustrating the Reigns of Claudius & Nero* (Cambridge 1939) Part I, no. 24; IGRR IV 1505; SEG XLIV 1205.

lifetime⁽²³⁾, and he was declared a *divus* in Rome after his death⁽²⁴⁾. His adopted son Nero could therefore call himself ‘son of god Claudius’.

An emphasis on the divine sonship of the emperor reappeared during the reign of Nero (54-68 CE). Several inscriptions have both the formula θεοῦ Κλαυδίου υἱός which calls Nero the son of the god Claudius and the formula θεοῦ Σεβαστοῦ ἀπόγονος/ἐγγονος which traces his lineage back to the god Augustus⁽²⁵⁾. The two-word formula θεοῦ υἱός occurs in three Athenian inscriptions, including one which was prominently displayed on the east architrave of the Parthenon⁽²⁶⁾. This formula also apparently appears on two issues of tetradrachmas struck in Antioch⁽²⁷⁾. While Nero was hailed as a god by various Greek sources⁽²⁸⁾, he was compelled to commit suicide. His death marked the end of the Julio-Claudian line, and no emperor claimed to be a son of the god Nero.

Vespasian, who ruled during 69-79 CE, was the first of the Flavians. He was neither the biological son nor the adopted son of any divinized predecessor, and his documents do not assert such a claim. But an Egyptian papyrus hailed him as a god at the beginning of his reign⁽²⁹⁾, and the same papyrus may have called him ἡ Ἀμμωνος υἱός⁽³⁰⁾. Other Greek sources also honor him as a divinity⁽³¹⁾, and he was designated a *divus* in Rome after his death. His sons Titus and Domitian could therefore each claim to be ‘son of god Vespasian’.

Despite the brevity of Titus’ reign (79-81 CE), he is identified as θεοῦ Οὐέσπασιανου υἱός by several sources⁽³²⁾. His titulature also revived the two-word formula θεοῦ υἱός. This formula occurs in an Asian inscription⁽³³⁾

⁽²³⁾ POxy 2555; *SEG* XXXVII 1221; SMALLWOOD, *Documents*, no. 135.

⁽²⁴⁾ Note the striking words ‘by the grace of the god Claudius’ in *IGRR* I 1263. Claudius is simply called ‘Claudius’ in Acts 11,28; 18,2.

⁽²⁵⁾ Both formulas occur in *IGRR* III 15; IV 1124 = SMALLWOOD, *Documents*, no. 412(b); *SIG* III 808; *SEG* IX 352 = CHARLESWORTH, *Documents*, Part II, no. 4b; *SEG* XLVI 2189. At least three of these inscriptions date from the early years of Nero’s reign.

⁽²⁶⁾ K.K. CARROLL, *The Parthenon Inscription* (GRBM 9) (Durham, NC 1982) 16-17, 41-43. The other two inscriptions are on marble bases; see *SEG* XXXII 252.

⁽²⁷⁾ BURNETT et al., *Roman Provincial Coinage*, I, 4174-4175. The name ‘Claudius’ in the genitive sequence Νέρωνος Κλαυδίου θεοῦ υἱ Καίσαρος Σεβ on these coins is ambiguous, for it could refer to Nero’s adoptive father Claudius or to Nero himself as ‘Nero Claudius’. The latter interpretation is supported by the fact that the name ‘Nero Claudius’ appears in unambiguous legends on many coins issued during Nero’s reign; see BURNETT et al., *Roman Provincial Coinage*, I, Part II, 777-778.

⁽²⁸⁾ SMALLWOOD, *Documents*, no. 64, 387; BURNETT et al., *Roman Provincial Coinage*, I, 2433-2434, 2923, 3107.

⁽²⁹⁾ P. JOUGUET, “Vespasien acclamé dans l’hippodrome d’Alexandrie”, *Mélanges de philologie, de littérature et d’histoire anciennes offerts à Alfred Ernout* (Paris 1940) 201-210. This reading and date are accepted by A. HENRICHs, “Vespasian’s Visit to Alexandria”, *ZPE* 3 (1968) 59; B. LEVICK, *Vespasian* (London 1999) 69.

⁽³⁰⁾ HENRICHs, “Vespasian’s Visit”, 59; LEVICK, *Vespasian*, 69. This conclusion is rejected by JOUGUET, “Vespasien”, 207-208.

⁽³¹⁾ K. SCOTT, *The Imperial Cult under the Flavians* (Stuttgart 1936) 33-34; P. BURETH, *Les Titulatures impériales dans les papyrus, les ostraca et les inscriptions d’Égypte (30 a.C. – 284 p.C.)* (Bruxelles 1964) 39; BURNETT et al., *Roman Provincial Coinage*, II, 726-729.

⁽³²⁾ *IGRR* III 690; IV 211; M. MCCRUM – A.G. WOODHEAD, *Select Documents of the Principates of the Flavian Emperors Including the Year of Revolution A.D. 68-96* (Cambridge 1966) no. 199. An expanded formula occurs in *IGRR* IV 845.

⁽³³⁾ *IGRR* IV 1559.

and may have stood in a Lycian inscription⁽³⁴⁾, and the two words in this formula stand in this order in a longer title in a Laodicean inscription⁽³⁵⁾. Various Greek sources call Titus a god⁽³⁶⁾, and he was consecrated a *divus* after his death. He could be simultaneously hailed as both ‘god’ and ‘son of god Vespasian’⁽³⁷⁾.

Domitian, who reigned during 81-96 CE, was the second son of the deified Vespasian. Though the three-word formula θεοῦ Οὐεσπασιανοῦ υἱός occurs in many references to Domitian⁽³⁸⁾, the two-word formula θεοῦ υἱός appears on nearly eighty coins minted in Tarsus, Anazarbus, Alexandria, and several Egyptian nomes⁽³⁹⁾. Note that all of these locations are in the East. While Domitian was hailed as a god by various Greek sources⁽⁴⁰⁾, he was assassinated. His death ended the Flavian line, and no successor claimed to be a son of the god Domitian.

In summary, the two-word formula θεοῦ υἱός and the three-word formula θεοῦ-father’s name-υἱός appear in references to the following five first-century emperors:

Emperor	Lineage	Son of god formulas
Augustus	Julius Caesar’s adopted son	θεοῦ υἱός and θεοῦ Ἰουλίου υἱός
Tiberius	Augustus’ adopted son	θεοῦ υἱός and θεοῦ Σεβαστοῦ υἱός
Nero	Claudius’ adopted son	θεοῦ υἱός and θεοῦ Κλαυδίου υἱός
Titus	Vespasian’s biological son	θεοῦ υἱός and θεοῦ Οὐεσπασιανοῦ υἱός
Domitian	Vespasian’s biological son	θεοῦ υἱός and θεοῦ Οὐεσπασιανοῦ υἱός

Note that Augustus, Tiberius, and Nero were adopted sons. Not until Titus became emperor in 79 CE did a biological son succeed his father.

The two-word formula θεοῦ υἱός appears not only in references to Augustus but also in references to Tiberius, Nero, Titus, and Domitian. Kim therefore erred when he claimed that this formula was ‘unique to Augustus, a title with which no other emperor, with the possible exception of Tiberius, could be associated’⁽⁴¹⁾. Besides occurring in a host of references to Augustus, this formula appears in a series of epigraphical references to Tiberius, occasional epigraphical and numismatic references to Nero, a few epigraphical references to Titus, and nearly eighty coins whose legends refer to Domitian. This formula even appears in an Athenian dedication to Drusus Caesar, a member of the imperial family who never became emperor⁽⁴²⁾.

⁽³⁴⁾ IGRR III 724.

⁽³⁵⁾ IGRR IV 846.

⁽³⁶⁾ SEG XXXIX 1388; BURETH, *Titulatures*, 40; MCCRUM – WOODHEAD, *Select Documents*, no. 111, 138(b).

⁽³⁷⁾ IGRR IV 211 = MCCRUM – WOODHEAD, *Select Documents*, no. 136.

⁽³⁸⁾ SEG XXVII 1009-1010; MCCRUM – WOODHEAD, *Select Documents*, no. 121, 123, 463. Cf. also the expanded formula in IGRR IV 1393.

⁽³⁹⁾ BURNETT et al., *Roman Provincial Coinage*, II, 1727-1728, 1746-1749, 1752-1756, 2598-2601, 2603-2605, 2610, 2615, 2619, 2657, 2667, 2671-2678, 2694-2713, 2721-2733, 2735, 2771-2774, 2777-2781; cf. also 2652, 2775-2776.

⁽⁴⁰⁾ IGRR I 862; SCOTT, *Imperial Cult*, 96-98; BURETH, *Titulatures*, 44; MCCRUM – WOODHEAD, *Select Documents*, no. 121.

⁽⁴¹⁾ KIM, “Anarthrous”, 225.

⁽⁴²⁾ EHRENBURG – JONES, *Documents*, no. 136.

While this formula occurs much more frequently in epigraphical references to Augustus than in epigraphical references to any other first century emperor, it occurs much more frequently in provincial coins whose legends refer to Domitian than in provincial coins which name any other first century emperor, including Augustus.

Three-word son of god formulas based on the model θεοῦ-father's name-υἱός also appear in references to Augustus, Tiberius, Nero, Titus, and Domitian. These three-word formulas explicitly identify the specific god (among the many Greco-Roman gods) whose paternity was being claimed. Matthew did not face such a problem, for he used the noun θεός only when referring to the one God proclaimed by his community⁽⁴³⁾. Nevertheless, there are parallels between the two-word Matthean formula θεοῦ υἱός and the three-word imperial formula θεοῦ-father's name-υἱός, for both have a prepositive genitive θεοῦ, both have the governing noun υἱός, and both are anarthrous.

The Roman inscriptions and other sources containing these son of god formulas proclaimed the 'good news' that imperial power was being transferred in an orderly manner from deified fathers to their sons. The titles of the other first century emperors, however, do not proclaim this message. Although Gaius Caligula called himself 'descendant of god Sebastos' early in his reign, he eventually demanded divine honors. Claudius eschewed claims of divine sonship, and various inscriptions identify him as simply 'son of Drusus'. Galba, Otho, Vitellius, and Vespasian, the emperors who ruled during the chaotic year of the four emperors (68-69 CE), were the sons of fathers who were never deified, and none of these emperors seems to have claimed that his father was a god, though Vespasian may have been called 'son of Ammon' in Alexandria. Nevertheless, it should be noted that the five emperors whose titulature contains the formulas θεοῦ υἱός and θεοῦ-father's name-υἱός did not rule for an insignificant amount of time, for they reigned for a combined total of nearly one hundred years.

3. *Matthean Contact with these Imperial Formulas*

The first section of this paper has shown that the christological formula θεοῦ υἱός occurs in the NT only in three passages in the Gospel of Matthew (14,33; 27,43.54), while the second section has shown that a prepositive genitive θεοῦ occurs in two types of Roman imperial son of god phrases: the two-word formula θεοῦ υἱός and three-word formulas like θεοῦ Σεβαστοῦ υἱός and θεοῦ Οὐεσπασιανοῦ υἱός. This section will explore ways in which members of Matthew's community could have learned about these imperial formulas.

The imperial cult celebrated and promulgated the claims of Rome and her emperors. As early as 29 BCE, Octavian permitted Pergamum to erect a provincial temple dedicated to the goddess Roma and himself⁽⁴⁴⁾. He

⁽⁴³⁾ W. SCHENK, *Die Sprache des Matthäus*. Die Text-Konstituenten in ihren makro- und mikrostrukturellen Relationen (Göttingen 1986) 285.

⁽⁴⁴⁾ S.J. FRIESEN, *Twice Neokoros*. Ephesus, Asia and the Cult of the Flavian Imperial Family (RGRW 116; Leiden – New York – Köln 1993) 7-15.

eventually became the recipient of cults in many other cities. Price claims that his cult was found in thirty-four cities in Asia Minor⁽⁴⁵⁾, and Hänlein-Schäfer studies sixty-six cult locations scattered throughout the empire⁽⁴⁶⁾.

Although the First Gospel does not announce where it was composed, scholars tend to locate the Matthean community in one of two eastern regions: Palestine, where various sites have been proposed, or Syria, where the most common choice is Antioch⁽⁴⁷⁾. Christians who lived in either region could have known about the imperial cult. Josephus reports that Herod erected temples for Augustus at Caesarea Maritima, Sebaste (Samaria), and Paneion (Caesarea Philippi)⁽⁴⁸⁾, and excavations have identified the probable locations of all three⁽⁴⁹⁾. Since the formula $\theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$ $\nu\iota\omicron\varsigma$ appears in many references to Augustus, Yarbrow Collins makes the reasonable assumption that this formula would have been celebrated at all three of these temples⁽⁵⁰⁾.

This formula must have also been well-known in Syria. In 27 BCE Augustus received Syria (along with Spain and Gaul, in addition to Egypt) as his province, and this special relationship continued throughout his reign. Antioch was the center of Roman power and authority in the province. Besides being the third largest city in the empire, Antioch was the seat of the governor of Syria, the center of the Roman administration of the province, the home of three or four legions, and the site of numerous temples, administrative buildings, statues, and other evidences of Roman power and authority⁽⁵¹⁾. Coins struck in Antioch during the first decade BCE may testify to the presence of the imperial cult in this city⁽⁵²⁾.

Although Augustus was consecrated a *divus* after his death, various inscriptions created years after his death honor him as both $\theta\epsilon\omicron\varsigma$ and $\theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$ $\nu\iota\omicron\varsigma$. One such inscription, for example, was created at Miletus about 50 CE⁽⁵³⁾. These inscriptions and the many earlier inscriptions which honor Augustus as $\theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$ $\nu\iota\omicron\varsigma$ served as mute witnesses to this imperial son of god formula long after they had been created. The continuing prominence of

⁽⁴⁵⁾ S.R.F. PRICE, *Rituals and Power*. The Roman Imperial Cult in Asia Minor (Cambridge 1984) 58.

⁽⁴⁶⁾ H. HÄNLEIN-SCHÄFER, *Veneratio Augusti*. Eine Studie zu den Tempeln des ersten römischen Kaisers (Archaeologica 39; Rome 1985) 113-254.

⁽⁴⁷⁾ For a survey of the locations proposed by forty scholars, see DAVIES – ALLISON, *Matthew*, I, 138-139.

⁽⁴⁸⁾ Josephus, *Bell. iud.*, 1.403, 404, 414; *Ant.*, 15.298, 339, 363-364.

⁽⁴⁹⁾ HÄNLEIN-SCHÄFER, *Veneratio Augusti*, 198-203; Z.U. MA'OZ, "Banias", *The New Encyclopedia of Archaeological Excavations in the Holy Land* (ed. E. STERN) (Jerusalem – New York 1993) I, 136-143, esp. 140; L.C. KAHN, "King Herod's Temple of Roma and Augustus at Caesarea Maritima", *Caesarea Maritima*. A Retrospective after Two Millennia (ed. A. RABAN – K.G. HOLM) (DMOA 21; Leiden 1996) 130-145. All three of these temples were probably dedicated to both Roma and Augustus.

⁽⁵⁰⁾ A. YARBROW COLLINS, "The Worship of Jesus and the Imperial Cult", *The Jewish Roots of Christological Monotheism*. Papers from the St. Andrews Conference on the Historical Origins of the Worship of Jesus (ed. C.C. NEWMAN – J.R. DAVILA – G.S. LEWIS) (JSJSup 63.; Leiden – Boston – Köln 1999) 256-257.

⁽⁵¹⁾ G. DOWNEY, *A History of Antioch in Syria from Seleucus to the Arab Conquest* (Princeton 1961) 179-182, 183, 191, 196, 202, 206-207; W. CARTER, *Matthew and the Margins*. A Sociopolitical and Religious Reading (JSNTSS 204; Sheffield 2000) 36-38.

⁽⁵²⁾ DOWNEY, *History of Antioch*, 167.

⁽⁵³⁾ SEG XLIV 938. See also SEG XI 922-23; XXXVII 1007.

Augustus is demonstrated by coins issued in his honor by Tiberius, Gaius, and other emperors⁽⁵⁴⁾.

Augustus was not the only emperor who received a cult. The cult of Tiberius, Livia, and the Senate was established at Smyrna during Tiberius' lifetime⁽⁵⁵⁾, and priests of Tiberius were eventually found in at least eleven cities in Asia Minor alone⁽⁵⁶⁾. Gaius ordered the province of Asia to establish a temple for him at Miletus⁽⁵⁷⁾, and he even decreed that his statue be placed in the temple in Jerusalem, though this decree was never carried out. But two factors suggest that the Flavians and their cult should receive our special attention. Given the probability that the Gospel of Matthew was composed sometime after the fall of Jerusalem in 70 CE, it is likely that this gospel was composed during the reign of one of the Flavians⁽⁵⁸⁾. And since the cults of the Julio-Claudian emperors (with the notable exception of Augustus) may not have survived long after the deaths of these emperors⁽⁵⁹⁾, it is questionable whether some of these earlier cults would have still been vital at the time when the First Gospel was being composed.

The power and authority of the Flavians would have been well-known in both Palestine and Syria. After being appointed governor of Judea during the Jewish war of independence, Vespasian subjugated Galilee and most of Judea before being acclaimed emperor in 69 CE. His son Titus captured Jerusalem in 70 CE and visited Antioch in triumph during the following year. Christians in Antioch would have walked by Vespasian's statue, and they would have seen the bronze figures that had been conspicuously located on two city gates by Titus to commemorate his triumph over Jerusalem and to celebrate Roman sovereignty⁽⁶⁰⁾.

We have seen that various Greek sources not only hail the Flavians as divinities but also bestow the titles θεοῦ υἱός and θεοῦ Οὐδеспασιανου υἱός on Titus and Domitian. The Flavian cult, which would have celebrated these claims, has left its mark on various sites throughout the empire, including several sites in Asia Minor. A cult for Vespasian was established at Pisidian Antioch⁽⁶¹⁾, and dedications to Vespasian were erected in Pamphylia, Bithynia, and Cilicia⁽⁶²⁾. A colossal statue of one of the Flavians, probably Titus or Domitian, stood in an imperial temple at Ephesus; in addition, this temple had thirteen dedications to Domitian that had been erected by thirteen different cities⁽⁶³⁾. Temples to Domitian were also established at Laodicea

⁽⁵⁴⁾ BURNETT et al., *Roman Provincial Coinage*, I, Part II, 773; II, Part II, 362.

⁽⁵⁵⁾ FRIESEN, *Twice Neokoros*, 15-21.

⁽⁵⁶⁾ PRICE, *Rituals and Power*, 58.

⁽⁵⁷⁾ L. ROBERT, "Le culte de Caligula à Milet et la province d'Asie", *Hellenica* 7 (1949) 206-238; FRIESEN, *Twice Neokoros*, 21-26.

⁽⁵⁸⁾ DAVIES – ALLISON, *Matthew*, I, 138, for example, conclude that "Matthew was almost certainly written between A.D. 70 and A.D. 100, in all probability between A.D. 80 and 95".

⁽⁵⁹⁾ PRICE, *Rituals and Power*, 61-62.

⁽⁶⁰⁾ CARTER, *Matthew and the Margins*, 37-38.

⁽⁶¹⁾ PRICE, *Rituals and Power*, 89.

⁽⁶²⁾ PRICE, *Rituals and Power*, 266, 273; LEVICK, *Vespasian*, 75.

⁽⁶³⁾ PRICE, *Rituals and Power*, 140, 178, 182, 187, and esp. 255; FRIESEN, *Twice Neokoros*, 29-75; G. Biguzzi, "Ephesus, Its Artemision, Its Temple to the Flavian Emperors, and Idolatry in Revelation", *NT* 40 (1998) 276-290.

and Anazarbus⁽⁶⁴⁾. While we lack comparable evidence for the Flavian cult in Syria and Palestine, a Syrian inscription preserves a letter in which Domitian refers to his father as ‘the god father Vespasian’⁽⁶⁵⁾ and two inscriptions at Gerasa call Domitian ‘son of god Vespasian’⁽⁶⁶⁾.

Although it is difficult to believe that members of Matthew’s community would have been unaware of the Roman imperial cult, it is impossible to document the extent of their knowledge. But disciples could have learned about the imperial son of god claims in other ways. Many of the inscriptions which touted these claims stood in highly-visible public locations like statue bases, dedications, honorary steles, public baths, theatres, archs, bridges, boundary stones, and even milestones. These inscriptions functioned like first century ‘billboards’ to advertise the power of Rome and her emperors, and many of these inscriptions remained visible long after they had been created. Even illiterate members of Matthew’s community who trudged past these inscriptions could have learned about their imperial claims from literate members of the community. These claims must have also been proclaimed orally.

Coins provided another ‘public’ proclamation of these imperial claims. Coins struck in Syria honor Augustus and Claudius as θεός, Tiberius as θεοῦ Σεβαστοῦ υἱός, and Augustus and Nero as θεοῦ υἱός⁽⁶⁷⁾. While coins minted in Judea during the reigns of Augustus and many of his successors lack such titles, coins struck in Judea during Domitian’s reign bear Latin legends which honor Vespasian as *divos* [sic] *Vespasianus*, Titus as *divos* [sic] *T*, and Domitian as *divi f*⁽⁶⁸⁾. Domitian is even honored as *divi Vesp* on coins issued by the last Herodian ruler, Agrippa II⁽⁶⁹⁾. Since these Judean and Syrian coins must have remained in circulation for many years, they must have continued to have advertised these imperial claims long after they had been struck.

4. θεοῦ υἱός in Roman Imperial Titles and Matthew

The christological formula θεοῦ υἱός occurs only three times in the NT, and all three are in Matthew. While all three are in Markan contexts, all three appear to be redactional. The first occurrence is in the distinctive Matthean conclusion to the story of Jesus walking on the sea. After seeing Jesus, the

⁽⁶⁴⁾ PRICE, *Rituals and Power*, 183, 264, 272. The Flavian cult was also established in the West; see P. SOUTHERN, *Domitian. Tragic Tyrant* (Bloomington – Indianapolis 1997) 37-38, 46.

⁽⁶⁵⁾ MCCRUM – WOODHEAD, *Select Documents*, no. 466.

⁽⁶⁶⁾ SEG XXVII 1009-1010. Concerning Domitian’s possible use of the title *dominus et deus noster*, see L.L. THOMPSON, *The Book of Revelation. Apocalypse and Empire* (New York – Oxford 1990) 104-107; B.W. JONES, *The Emperor Domitian* (London – New York 1992) 108-109.

⁽⁶⁷⁾ W. WRUCK, *Die syrische Provinzialprägung von Augustus bis Traian* (Stuttgart 1931) 17-18, 44, 178-181; BURNETT et al., *Roman Provincial Coinage*, I, 4006, 4087 (?), 4150, 4161, 4174-4175. Coins struck in Tarsus and Anazarbus, cities which had been part of the province of Syria prior to about 72 CE, call Domitian θεοῦ υἱός; see BURNETT et al., *Roman Provincial Coinage*, II, 1727-1728; 1746-1749, 1752-1756.

⁽⁶⁸⁾ BURNETT et al., *Roman Provincial Coinage*, II, 2231, 2300-2303. A coin struck in Paneas even used the word *diva* when referring to Poppaea and Claudia. See BURNETT et al., *Roman Provincial Coinage*, I, 4846.

⁽⁶⁹⁾ BURNETT et al., *Roman Provincial Coinage*, II, 2265-2266, 2269-2272.

disciples in the boat worshiped him saying, 'Truly you are God's Son (θεοῦ υἱός)' (14,33). These words have no synoptic parallels; though the final six words of 14,32 repeat words found in the Markan parallel (6,51), the twelve words in Matt 14,33, including this christological formula, occur only in the First Gospel. The second occurrence of this formula is in the crucifixion narrative in the religious leaders' assertion that Jesus had said, 'I am God's Son (θεοῦ εἰμι υἱός)' (27,43). This statement occurs only in Matthew; it is absent from the parallel synoptic accounts⁽⁷⁰⁾. The third occurrence of θεοῦ υἱός is in the words 'Truly this man was God's Son (θεοῦ υἱός)' spoken by the centurion and those who were with him (27,54). Matthew produced the wording of this christological formula by inverting the word order of the phrase υἱός θεοῦ found in Mark 15,39.

While all three of the Matthean occurrences of θεοῦ υἱός appear to be redactional, this formula does not possess typical Matthean linguistic features. The three occurrences of this formula represent (1) three of the four Matthean phrases which have only a prepositive anarthrous genitive noun and an anarthrous governing noun⁽⁷¹⁾, (2) three of the four Matthean phrases which place a dependent genitive noun ahead of the governing noun υἱός⁽⁷²⁾, and (3) all three of the Matthean phrases which have a prepositive dependent genitive θεοῦ⁽⁷³⁾. How can it be explained that this presumably redactional formula possesses such atypical linguistic features? Matthew must have been mimicking an existing formula, either a formula like the imperial son of god formula or a christological formula that was already in use within his community⁽⁷⁴⁾.

Scholars who have examined the relationship between early Christian Son of God formulas and Roman imperial usage have often focused on the Markan phrase υἱός θεοῦ, especially its use in the centurion's 'confession' in Mark 15,39⁽⁷⁵⁾. Yarbrow Collins, for example, has argued that this Markan phrase would have evoked the imperial cult for at least some members of Mark's audience⁽⁷⁶⁾. One objection to her conclusion, though not a fatal objection, is that first century imperial son of god formulas normally had the word order θεοῦ υἱός rather than the inverted word order found in Mark 15,39⁽⁷⁷⁾. Unlike this Markan formula, the Matthean θεοῦ υἱός exactly parallels the two-word son of god formulas found in the Greek titulature of Augustus, Tiberius, Nero, Titus, and Domitian. In addition, this Matthean formula has the same opening word (θεοῦ) and the same closing word (υἱός)

⁽⁷⁰⁾ Cf. Mark 15,32; Luke 23,35.

⁽⁷¹⁾ The fourth phrase is in Matt 27,33.

⁽⁷²⁾ The fourth phrase is in Matt 13,55. Note, in contrast, the word order of the phrase υἱοὶ θεοῦ in 5,9. Cf. also 5,45.

⁽⁷³⁾ R.L. MOWERY, "Subtle Differences: The Matthean 'Son of God' References", *NT* 32 (1990) 198-199.

⁽⁷⁴⁾ Such a christological formula, if it existed, could have originally been modeled after an existing formula like the imperial son of god formula.

⁽⁷⁵⁾ See KIM, "Anarthrous", 221-241; JOHNSON, "Mark 15,39", 406-413; and the other studies they cite.

⁽⁷⁶⁾ YARBROW COLLINS, "Worship of Jesus", 257, though she claims that the royal and messianic use of this epithet in Jewish tradition represents 'the best analogy and perhaps the source of its application to Jesus' in Mark.

⁽⁷⁷⁾ A rare exception occurs in *IGRR* IV 1173.

as the anarthrous three-word son of god formulas found in the Greek titulature of these five emperors.

Whether Matthew created the formula θεοῦ υἱός or was repeating a christological formula already in use within his community, it is likely that this formula would have evoked Roman imperial usage for at least some members of his community⁽⁷⁸⁾. Whether or not these disciples had learned of the Roman formula θεοῦ υἱός through the imperial cult, some (most?) of them would have known about this imperial formula through inscriptions located in highly-visible locations and through legends on their coins, including coins struck in their own province. For these disciples, the Matthean formula θεοῦ υἱός would have evoked not only an awareness that Jesus had been given the same title as the emperor but also the recognition that the θεοῦ υἱός whose Father is ‘Lord of heaven and earth’ (Matt 11,25) is not the emperor but Jesus.

Illinois Wesleyan University
Bloomington, IL 61702 (USA)

Robert L. MOWERY

SUMMARY

The christological formula θεοῦ υἱός, which appears in the NT only in three Matthean passages (14,33; 27,43.54), exactly parallels the two-word Roman imperial son of god formula found in the titulature of Augustus, Tiberius, Nero, Titus, and Domitian. This formula occurred more widely in first century imperial titulature than has previously been reported; in addition, various three-word imperial son of god formulas also deserve notice. The Matthean formula θεοῦ υἱός would have evoked Roman imperial usage for at least some members of Matthew’s community.

⁽⁷⁸⁾ KIM, “Anarthrous”, 240, concludes that Mark’s use of the language of the Roman imperial cult in 1,1 and 15,39 was ‘deliberate’. This conclusion is rightly rejected by JOHNSON, “Mark 15,39”, 407-408. We are focusing not on Matthew’s intentions but on the likely response of some members of his community. Cf. CARTER, *Matthew and the Margins*, 537.

RECENSIONES

Vetus Testamentum

Anthony F. CAMPBELL – Mark A. O'BRIEN, *Unfolding the Deuteronomistic History*. Origins, Upgrades, Present Text. Minneapolis, MN, Fortress Press, 2000. vi-505 p. 21 × 23,5. Paperback: \$37.00 (list price)

Il y a quelques années, A.F. Campbell et M. O'Brien avaient fourni aux exégètes un instrument de travail de toute première valeur (*Sources of the Pentateuch: Texts, Introductions, Annotations* [Minneapolis 1993]; voir *Bib* 77 [1996] 245-265 pour une présentation de cet ouvrage avec d'autres introductions au Pentateuque). Le second volume, fruit de la même collaboration, est la suite logique de leur première initiative puisqu'il est consacré au Deutéronome et à l'histoire deutéronomiste (Josué – 2 Rois).

Le volume sur le Pentateuque avait pour but de remettre en honneur l'hypothèse documentaire classique telle que M. Noth l'avait connue alors que cette hypothèse était (et est encore) de plus en plus combattue. Le travail pouvait donc s'appuyer sur une recherche longue de presque deux siècles et sur un consensus relatif de près d'un siècle. Le volume sur l'histoire deutéronomiste apparaît dans un contexte intellectuel diamétralement opposé. En effet, la recherche sur cette partie de la Bible a commencé pratiquement avec la publication en 1943 de la célèbre étude de M. Noth, *Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien: Die sammelnden und bearbeitenden Geschichtswerke im Alten Testament* (Halle 1943; Stuttgart 1948); traduction anglaise: *The Deuteronomistic History* (JSOTS 15; Sheffield 1981 [21991]). C'est seulement à partir de 1968 environ que l'hypothèse de M. Noth a été reprise, critiquée, complétée ou corrigée, à peu près en même temps que se levaient les premières voix contraires à l'hypothèse documentaire. La critique de Noth a pris deux directions différentes, comme on le sait: l'école de Cross distingue deux rédactions, l'une à l'époque de Josias et l'autre exilique, tandis que Smend et ses disciples, Dietrich et Veijola, parlent d'une rédaction exilique suivie de deux révisions, l'une d'esprit prophétique (DtrP) et l'autre centrée sur la loi (DtrN, de nomos, «loi») (2-4). Le travail est donc encore à ses débuts et la situation plutôt confuse. Les auteurs du présent volume en sont d'ailleurs parfaitement conscients.

L'introduction explique en détails l'intention des auteurs et la méthode adoptée. Suit le texte des différents livres analysés (Dt, Jos, Jg, 1-2 S, 1-2 R) dans la traduction anglaise de la *New Revised Standard Version* (1989), avec quelques légères modifications lorsque cela est jugé nécessaire.

Chaque livre est précédé d'une introduction propre. Le texte est imprimé de telle sorte que la répartition en sources et rédactions proposée par les auteurs est immédiatement apparente. La disposition typographique permet en effet de les distinguer sans problèmes. Le volume se conclut par une liste des ouvrages cités, une série de tableaux et de listes de formules particulièrement importantes pour l'analyse proposée ici, et un index des références bibliques.

S'il fallait caractériser l'ensemble du travail, nous dirions qu'il se veut «œcuménique» au sens où il cherche avant tout à réconcilier les tendances opposées de la recherche actuelle. Les auteurs désirent notamment reprendre le meilleur des études synchroniques, comme celles de Polzin, mais ils tiennent surtout à rendre compte des difficultés du texte actuel (tensions, contradictions, différences de style et de théologie), c'est-à-dire de l'aspect diachronique (genèse et développement) (4-7). Les notes explicatives offrent un bon exemple de cet effort de conciliation entre différentes méthodes. En général, elles comportent trois parties: une première sur les indications textuelles (*text signals*); une seconde sur la genèse du texte (*text-history approach*); la dernière, sur le texte dans sa forme actuelle (*present-text potential*).

Par ailleurs, les auteurs veulent aussi instaurer un début de dialogue entre les écoles de Harvard (Cross) et de Göttingen (Smend, Dietrich, Veijola). Avec Cross, ils admettent l'existence d'une rédaction josianique de l'histoire deutéronomiste, rédaction optimiste et favorable à la monarchie. Avec l'école de Göttingen, ils plaident en faveur d'une série de «révisions» exiliques ou postexiliques, moins optimistes et plus critiques envers le peuple (*national focus*) et la monarchie (*royal focus*) (13-17).

Enfin, l'ouvrage se veut à la fois exégétique et théologique. Il ne se contente pas d'analyser les textes et de les dater. Il cherche aussi à découvrir la signification des sources et, ce qui est plus intéressant peut-être, du travail éditorial. En accord avec les tendances les plus récentes de la recherche, ce volume veut réhabiliter la figure du «rédacteur» qui a été souvent dédaignée ou discréditée par la critique à l'époque où le romantisme n'avait d'yeux que pour les œuvres originales composées par les «grands esprits» (5-6).

Les auteurs proposent aussi quelques hypothèses qui leur sont propres. Ils parlent notamment d'une «histoire prophétique» (*Prophetic Record*) qui serait l'une des sources principales du texte de 1 S 1 – 2 R 10, selon la thèse de A.F. Campbell (*Of Prophets and Kings: A Late Ninth-Century Document* [1 Samuel 1 – 2 Kings 10] [CBQMS 17; Washington 1986]). M.A. O'Brien, de son côté, a exposé ses idées sur l'histoire deutéronomiste dans son ouvrage *The Deuteronomistic History Hypothesis: A Reassessment* (OBO 92; Freiburg [Schweiz] – Göttingen 1989). Les auteurs reconnaissent également leur dette envers le travail de G.A. Auld, *Kings Without Privilege: David and Moses in the Story of the Bible's Kings* (Edinburgh 1994).

La situation est parfois complexe, comme le montre l'analyse de la composition du livre de Josué. Les auteurs distinguent six phases principales (104-105): (1) un ancien récit de la conquête (Jos 2,1–10,42-43*); (2) une expansion de ce premier récit en deux phases: (a) les trois récits «sacrés» du passage du Jourdain (Jos 3–4*), de la prise de Jéricho (Jos 6*) et de la défaite devant Ai (Jos 7*); (b) la conquête du Nord (Jos 11–12*); (3) l'auteur de

l'histoire deutéronomiste josianique unifie ces textes et leur ajoute une introduction (Jos 1,1-6), il insère quelques notes ponctuelles et rédige la conclusion qui se trouve à présent en 21,43-45; (4) il faut attribuer à une révision exilique l'exhortation initiale de 1,7-9 et la recommandation finale de 23,1-16; (5) à ce stade furent aussi ajoutés les textes sur la répartition de la terre (Jos 14,1-19,51), sur les cités de refuge et les villes lévétiques (Jos 20,1-9; 21,1-42); (6) enfin, les additions les plus récentes seraient l'histoire de l'autel près du Jourdain (Jos 22,9-34); le récit du retour des tribus transjordanien dans leur patrie (22,1-6); la liste des rois transjordanien (12,1-6); le compte rendu de l'établissement de certaines tribus à l'est du Jourdain (Jos 13); le récit de l'assemblée de Sichem (Jos 24); les textes sur la complète destruction des peuples cananéens. On notera que Jos 24 est considéré comme très tardif (voir la discussion, 161-162).

Pour le livre des Juges, les auteurs s'appuient sur les travaux de W. Richter (*Die Bearbeitungen des «Retterbuches» in der deuteronomischen Epoche* [BBB 21; Bonn 1964]; id., *Traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zum Richterbuch* [BBB 18; Bonn 1966]). Les textes anciens repris par l'histoire deutéronomiste seraient au nombre de quatre: une collection de «récits de délivrance» (Jg 3,7-8,28) (cf. Richter); l'histoire de la royauté d'Abimelek (Jg 9); les traditions sur Jephthé et d'autres «petits juges»; les traditions sur Samson (Jg 13-16).

En ce qui concerne les livres de Samuel, les sources principales sont l'histoire prophétique (Campbell), «l'histoire de l'arche» (1 S 4-6*; 2 S 6*), «l'histoire de l'ascension de David sur le trône» (1 S 16 - 2 S 5*) et «l'histoire des dernières années de David» (2 S 9-20*; 1 R 1-2*) (plutôt que «histoire de la succession de David», titre donné par L. Rost). L'auteur de l'histoire deutéronomiste s'est contenté le plus souvent d'annoter ses sources (1 S 3,34-36; 2 S 4,4-5; 7,1b.11.13; 8,1a.14b). Ici, plus encore qu'ailleurs, il semble que le Deutéronomiste de Campbell et O'Brien soit plus un compilateur qu'un véritable auteur. Et ne faudrait-il accorder plus d'importance au travail littéraire de l'époque postexilique?

Parmi les sources des livres des Rois, il faut compter, selon nos auteurs, trois séries de textes: (1) une expansion de l'histoire prophétique (qui couvre 2 R 11-25*); (2) une liste des rois du royaume du Nord; (3) une liste des rois du royaume du Sud qui remonte à l'époque d'Ézéchias.

En gros, les textes sont répartis en trois groupes principaux. Au centre, il faut placer «l'histoire deutéronomiste» datant de l'époque de Josias. Cette histoire est favorable à la monarchie et le ton adopté est optimiste. Cette «histoire deutéronomiste» a intégré un certain nombre de «sources» qui sont par conséquent préjosianiques. Enfin, après la mort de Josias à Mégiddo (609 avant notre ère) et l'échec de la réforme deutéronomique, le texte de «l'histoire deutéronomiste» a subi toute une série de révisions qui sont en général critiques et plutôt pessimistes. Une de ces révisions rend le peuple responsable de l'échec (*national focus*), une autre accuse la monarchie (*royal focus*). Un tableau (35-36) donne une vue d'ensemble de ces trois groupes de textes ou de couches rédactionnelles. Les titres courants au bas des pages permettent au lecteur de s'y retrouver avec très grande facilité. L'ouvrage est certainement «convivial» (*reader friendly*); il faut en féliciter et les auteurs et les éditeurs.

Les introductions à chacun des livres traitent des problèmes théologiques que rencontrent les lecteurs contemporains, avant d'aborder les questions de sources et de compositions. Par exemple, l'introduction au Deutéronome parle de la théologie de l'alliance. Le livre de Josué est le livre qui décrit un peuple d'Israël presque parfait et un Dieu qui commande de massacrer des populations innocentes, ce qui est scandaleux et incompréhensible pour le lecteur moderne. Le livre des Juges, contrairement à l'opinion de Noth et de von Rad, ne décrit pas une époque idéale de l'histoire d'Israël. Bien au contraire, le livre montre que la situation ne cesse de se détériorer à partir de la mort de Josué. À la fin, cette situation est devenue insupportable et la seule solution qui s'impose est l'introduction de la monarchie. Le jugement sur la monarchie dans les livres de Samuel est plus nuancé que ne le prétendent tous ceux qui ont suivi Noth. L'histoire deutéronomiste est en fait favorable à l'instauration de la monarchie. C'est à elle qu'il faut attribuer les textes de 1 S 1–12 qui vont dans ce sens. 1 S 12, qui pour Noth tentait de réconcilier les tendances favorables et défavorables à la monarchie et proposait — de mauvais gré — une sorte de compromis, insatisfaisant par ailleurs, est en fait un texte très tardif (218; 245-248). Il faut dire que Noth s'est sans doute identifié au Deutéronomiste et qu'il a vu un parallèle entre la fin du troisième *Reich*, auquel il était viscéralement opposé, et le processus de dégradation qui a causé la fin brutale de la monarchie en Israël et en Juda. Les livres des Rois, de leur côté, confrontent le lecteur avec un gros problème qui, d'ailleurs, ne reçoit pas de solution satisfaisante: le rôle du royaume du Nord dans l'histoire du salut.

Le livre du Deutéronome est peut-être la partie qui sera la plus discutée. Il faut dire que c'est aussi un des domaines où il règne une extrême confusion. Les auteurs citent régulièrement les travaux de Preuss, Mayes et Nielsen et les positions adoptées sont prudentes et méritent certainement l'attention. Mais ne fallait-il pas adopter une méthode légèrement différente pour analyser le Dt? Le lecteur notera par exemple que le texte de Dt 6–11 est très peu annoté et attribué dans son ensemble à une seule rédaction préjosianique, mis à part quelques rares versets (6,1.2-3; 11,29-32). La même chose vaut pour le code deutéronomique (Dt 12–26), lui aussi entièrement préjosianique. Ici encore, les notes sont rares et se contentent la plupart du temps de mentionner la répartition en sources proposée par Mayes, Nielsen et Preuss. Les chapitres qui sont les plus étudiés sont, comme il fallait s'y attendre, Dt 1–3 et 27-31.34. Somme toute, il ne faudra pas s'étonner si certains lecteurs restent sur leur faim.

Un autre point délicat est l'utilisation, assez sporadique, des études littéraires dans l'analyse des textes. Le point de vue des auteurs est en fin de compte certainement plus diachronique que synchronique, plus analytique que synthétique, plus théologique et «politique» que littéraire au sens large du terme. Mais il fallait choisir et personne n'en voudra aux auteurs d'avoir limité leurs ambitions.

Il n'est pas possible, dans le cadre de cette présentation, de discuter en détails les options de nos deux auteurs. Il faut reconnaître, toutefois, qu'ils offrent à la recherche un instrument qui n'a pas d'équivalent aujourd'hui. Ils réussissent à informer le lecteur sur l'histoire de la recherche sans le noyer dans une mer de noms et d'opinions. En outre, ils présentent une vue

complète de tous les textes qui font partie de l'histoire deutéronomiste, ce qui n'avait jamais été fait jusqu'à présent. Enfin, l'argumentation est succincte, mais solide. Il s'agit d'un bel exemple d'exégèse raisonnée pour lequel il faut remercier et féliciter nos auteurs.

Via della Pilotta, 25
I-00187 Roma

Jean Louis SKA

Jan P. FOKKELMAN, *Major Poems of the Hebrew Bible. At the Interface of Prosody and Structural Analysis. Volume II: Psalms and Job 4–14* (Studia Semitica Neerlandica 41). Assen, Van Gorcum, 2000. 550 p. 16 × 24,5. Dfl 250

This work constitutes the second of at least four expected volumes treating the poetry of the Hebrew Bible. Volume I is subtitled "At the Interface of Hermeneutics and Structural Analysis" and contains analyses of Exod 15, Deut 32 and Job 3. Volume III will investigate the 61 psalms which are not treated in the current volume. Volume IV will continue Fokkelman's structural study of the poetry of Job. For this writer's review of Volume I, see *Bib* 81 (2000) 271-275.

Most of this volume is devoted to a prosodic analysis of 89 psalms and 11 chapters from Job. Fokkelman applied the term 'prosody' to a broad range of textual treatments including quantitative measurements, studies of standards and divergence from those standards, and attention to patterns of repetition. Fokkelman understood his work to be sufficiently broad so as to be described by the word *Literaturwissenschaft*. The term affords no English equivalent, but the term 'poetics' approaches its meaning (52). Fokkelman's 'poetic' method centers upon the discipline of colometry. He begins and ends with measures of the numbers of beats per verse, recorded in the sub-units, cola.

Chapter one contains an effective overview of the terms and methods employed in the volume. The strategies are fully explained and some of the conclusions of the book are anticipated. The heart of the chapter is the methodology for the counting of syllables, or beats. The approach includes attention to the numerical values of several levels: beats, cola, verses, strophes, and stanzas. The numerical patterns of each psalm and the those of Job 4–14 are discussed in the course of chapters 2 and 3. Emendations of the Masoretic Text are made sparingly on the basis of aberrations in metrical balance at the level of verses.

Chapter two contains notes on the analysis of 89 psalms (a few psalms are treated together as single poetic units). This comprises nearly half the length of the work (240 pages). The approach is pragmatic. It consists of a straightforward overview of the structural, syntactical and linguistic nature of each poem. Some of the discussions are very full, such as the 19 pages devoted to Psalm 78. Briefer psalms receive treatment in a span of two pages.

Statistical tables present the raw data that Fokkelman employed as the

basis for his claims regarding the construction and meaning of each of the poems. The following reproduces the table for Psalm 100 (50, 448). Narrative discussion of the Psalm appears on pages 258-259.

Ps 100		S+	L+		
		50	41		
strophe	verse				
1	1,2ab	3.3.1.2 / 2.1.2.3 / 2.3.2		9+8+8 = 25	
	3abc	2.1.2.1.3 / 1.3.2.3 / 2.2.3		9+9+7 = 25	
2	4ab	2.3.3 / 4.3		8+7 = 15	
	4cd	2.1 / 3.2		3+5 = 8	
	5abc	1.1.2 / 3.2 / 2.1.2.4		4+5+9 = 18	
				50	
				41	

S+ and L+ designate one short (one or two lines) and one long (three or more lines) strophe. The remainder of the chart is self explanatory. All measurements are based on the count of syllables which conforms to the Masoretic consonantal text wherever possible. Some proportion of the discussion of each poem is devoted to suggestions of variant readings or minor changes in the Masoretic accents or other such textual concerns.

Fokkelman's analysis of Psalm 30 can be compared to the more pedantic practice of syllable counting offered by E.R. Wendland ("Continuity and Discontinuity in Hebrew Poetic Design: Patterns and Points of Significance in the Structure and Setting of Psalm 30", *Discourse Perspectives on Hebrew Poetry in the Scriptures* [ed. E.R. Wendland] [UBS Monograph Series 7; New York 1994] 48). Wendland found only 13 lines of poetry, whereas Fokkelman apportioned the text into 15 'verses' made up of 33 cola. Wendland's reading is determined more by the language of the Hebrew text (that is, its meaning) while Fokkelman concentrates on sound. Neither slavishly follows the accentuation marks of the MT. The key difference is perhaps in the way that Wendland's overview is predetermined by traditional translation. Fokkelman, on the other hand, finds metrical indications which could lead to adjustments in translation. Fokkelman comments on the rhetorical pattern — 'one clause = one colon' by which the psalm could be construed as less a theological discourse (as Wendland tends to present it) and more as a series of isolated complaints. Fokkelman's colometric observations offer a great deal of potential for various structural analyses of various psalms, while studies like that of Wendland provide little framework for future application.

Some comparisons can be made with Watson's analysis of Psalm 123 (W.G.E. Watson, *Classical Hebrew Poetry: A Guide to its Techniques* [JSOTSS 26; Sheffield 1986] 366-368) and Fokkelman's. Fokkelman identifies verse one as an independent strophe. Verse 2 comprises one strophe and v. 3, a third. Both Fokkelman and Watson omit the superscription. Watson reads verse one as part of the first of two strophes. In this case, Watson's reading seems more in keeping with the narrative development of the poem. He connects verse one to v. 2 on the basis of semantics: The word 'eyes' appears in verse one and well as v. 2. Watson more or less identifies the plea of v. 3 as the center of the psalm: 'Pity us, Yahweh, pity us!'. Fokkelman concentrates on the last line of v. 2 as the 'sentence core' of the

central strophe (296): 'so our eyes look to the Lord our God'. By isolating the introductory verse, Fokkelman draws attention to the striking three line unit in which two similes anticipate the focus of the worshiper's eyes on Yahweh. There is little doubt about the focus of the poem. Both scholars emphasize its nature as a prayer for help. Fokkelman's system serves as a constant reminder of the balance of biblical poetry. This idea of metrical balance (which for Fokkelman means median length of cola) can be applied at all levels of poetic construction: verses, strophes, and so on.

Appendix I presents the statistical tables for the psalms discussed in chapter two and includes five additional psalms. The format follows that of the statistical table above. The combination of the tables in this appendix and the rationales given in chapter two constitutes a valuable resource for Psalms specialists. Several scholars have produced similar syllable counts, but applied them only to select psalms. This comprehensive list will serve as a starting point, or at least as a sounding board, for others initiating any sort of interpretation dependent upon metrical analysis.

Appendix II contains less specific data on the 150 psalms of the Hebrew canon. This data is less helpful, because it does not include the specific counts of beats per colon. This makes it nearly impossible to reproduce Fokkelman's line by line demarcation of syllables. So, for each poem, these tables indicate only the raw number of strophes, verses, cola, words, and syllables. These numbers can be used to determine the number of syllables per word, cola, verse, and so forth.

Chapter 3 contains a chapter by chapter analysis of Job 4–14. The selected portion of Job covers the first of the 3 cycles of challenges-responses between Job and his friends. Chapter 3 would normally be considered part of the unit. Fokkelman describes chap. 3 as preliminary, however, the chapter was analyzed in Volume I of *Major Poems*. Fokkelman designates the colometry of Job as 'unproblematic' (325). The text does not require adjustments to achieve perfect balance of lines. Such adjustments are frequently employed in his analyses of the Psalms. He associates Job's simpler colometry with the syntax of the discourses: In Job, each b-colon tends to present a new thought rather than refining the thought of the a-colon. The reduced semantic constraint allows for more uniform colon structure. The uniformity of Job's poetry applies to larger levels in addition to the level of lines. Fokkelman also found a high degree of balance in the macrostructure of Job 3–14. He identified two pairs of 3 succeeding chapters with nearly equal totals of cola per pair (381, 538).

Fokkelman's conclusions provide a broader focus for the consideration of the atomistic details of his charts. He notes that in the Psalms the average number of syllables per colon fall between 7 and 9. Approximately half of the psalms he studied showed an average of precisely 8 syllables per colon. Eight is also the norm for Job. The number eight is so typical, that dividing the number of syllables in the entire Book of Psalms by the number of cola, yields almost exactly eight. Semantically, the *verse* (usually 2-3 cola) serves as the basic unit for study as revealed in the time honored study of parallel structures. In contrast to our preoccupation with semantic structure, the rather precise measure of cola indicates that the *colon* was the basic unit Hebrew poets used to achieve balance and reveal proportions. Fokkelman supposes

that the writers of Hebrew poetry counted syllables, not for the sake of numbers or for rigid metrical design, but to 'form patterns' (383) at the levels of words, cola, verses, and strophes.

The most enduring contribution of Fokkelman's approach he expressed as follows: 'The discovery of the syllabic-numerical aspect provides a new criterion for determining the correct reading of the text, and the correct division of the poem. It may occasionally be appealed to when taking a decision about a disputed passage' (384). In keeping with the symmetry of his syllable counts, Fokkelman discovered that the so called 'doxologies' that end Books 1, 2 and 4 of the Psalms appear central to the construction of the psalms rather than editorial (385).

Fokkelman claims 'the emergence of the norm figure [8 beats per colon] confirms the method of counting pre-Masoretic syllables' (384). This proof would be more convincing if more poetic units actually followed a precise 8 beat pattern (or for that matter, 7 or 9). Instead, the length of cola in each poem is always rather erratic. The fact that the 8 beats occur as a median or a mean indicates that the poets wrote without conscious effort to achieve an 8 beat pattern. It remains possible that this predilection can be explained in terms of some other linguistic or cultural phenomenon. In other words, the writers may not have 'counted' the beats per cola/line but may have been influenced by some external influences to produce the average length.

In general, Fokkelman depends on a structured approach which he applies to all poetry in much the same way. Other theorists would claim that since poems are independent structures, methodologies should be developed with the uniqueness of the given poem in mind. This is not to claim that Fokkelman's approach is invalid. In fact, given the corporate nature of Hebrew poetry, one would be in error to consider each Hebrew poem as an absolutely independent creation. The point is, that such a programmatic approach as Fokkelman's cannot provide the basis for a full explication of most poetic units. No single strategy for poetic study can provide more than an individual piece of the puzzle. With this in mind, it might be helpful for the author to indicate some possible applications of his precise approach for those explicating biblical poetry by means of form criticism, reader oriented studies, or canonical concerns. He does offer some rather convincing suggestions relating to textual criticism.

Fokkelman's numeric studies of Hebrew poetry provide useful insights and large amounts of data for future studies. These resources will be even more useful when all four volumes are produced. For individual investigations of Psalms and Job, especially those concerned with methodologies for the interpretation of Hebrew poetry, Fokkelman's conclusions will prove indispensable. Though Fokkelman's work is limited by its almost exclusive attention to rhythmic structure, this very limitation yields the statistical data that can be applied in broader fashion. It remains for interpreters from various quarters to build on the basic suggestions and statistical information of *Major Poems*.

University of Mobile
P.O. Box 13220
Mobile, AL 36663 (USA)

Donald K. BERRY

Yiu-Wing FUNG, *Victim and Victimizer. Joseph's Interpretation of his Destiny* (JSOTSS 308). Sheffield, Academic Press, 2000. 222 p. 16 × 24. \$73.00

Because the theme of rivalry between brothers runs throughout the Book of Genesis, readers tend to focus on the alienation and subsequent reconciliation that take place between the brothers as the key to understanding the Joseph story. Yiu-Wing Fung, in a dissertation written under the direction of David J.A. Clines, takes a different approach. Isolating the choice between subservience and survival as a theme that runs throughout the story, Fung quite properly gives major emphasis to Gen 47, in which the Egyptians ultimately sell themselves into slavery as a result of the famine sweeping the land. Structurally, chap. 47 is also a part of the dream sequence that had begun in chap. 41. Joseph believes that God has made him lord of the land, with a mandate to save it from death by starvation. But why would this former slave choose to put a whole nation into bondage as the price of deliverance? Whereas most scholars perceive this activity as an example of Joseph's administrative brilliance, Fung sees it as an example of his ruthlessness. How could things go so wrong? The answer, Fung claims, can be found in a close analysis of what Joseph says throughout the story.

There is a direct connection between slavery and salvation in Joseph's mind, but for Fung this is a cruel delusion that leads Joseph to repeat the crime of slavery on the Egyptians. When he discloses himself to his brothers, he changes 'you sold' to 'God sent' (45,7). Joseph is really trying to calm his brothers' guilt feelings, but in fact his disclosure speech serves the dual purpose of excusing both his period of bondage and justifying the dreams that envision his lordship as all a part of God's providence. God causes Joseph's pit experiences and brings on the famine, but God also raises Joseph up before Pharaoh and uses him to 'save' the people from famine. In 50,20 Joseph admits that his pit experiences were evil, implicitly making God the originator of his suffering. God's actions are paralleled by characters in the story. There is an analogy to Reuben's action, for example, who attempted to save Joseph by first placing him in the pit. Even more to the point, there is the parallel to Judah's action, who at first is responsible for selling Joseph into slavery, but ends up rescuing his father from death when he offers to remain a slave so that Benjamin might return. Fung concludes: 'So, the "divine good" claimed by Joseph cannot override the "human evil" because this "divine good" is not high above its opposite, "human evil". This "divine good" is contaminated by its opposite at the very heart of its structure' (51).

Fung will later undermine this perspective, devoting an entire chapter that tries to create ironic distance between the voices of Joseph and the narrator. His principal argument is the victimizer > rescuer parallel between Judah and God that I have already described. Fung believes that this Judah-God parallel confirms the narrator's opposition to the theme of subservience for survival, because it equates Judah's negative role in selling Joseph into slavery with God's role in bringing the famine. And since Joseph is unaware of Judah's role in his pit experience, Fung concludes that 'it is highly possible that Joseph is the target of the narrator's ironic treatment' (121). But Joseph had

already told Pharaoh that dreams come from God. Fung would have to interpret the dreams and their interpretation as ironic in order for his interpretation to work. Furthermore, the repeated refrain of the Lord's being with Joseph makes these narrow escapes from death more a sign of divine providence than an indication of the narrator's ironic distance.

A major theme of the Joseph story is divine favoritism which, according to Fung, readers perceive merely as parental favoritism. This theme is even stronger in the end of Genesis than it is in the beginning. The dreams are at the heart of the conflict; but whereas most readers condemn the immature behavior of the favored one, Fung insists that the narrator's target is more properly aimed at the divine Favored. Behind this story he sees an allegory of favoritism tied to the rise of the Israelite monarchy, that saves the family from famine and acts to overcome the alienation among the brothers/tribes. When Jacob crosses his arms in giving the preferred blessing to Ephraim over Manasseh, and when Judah proclaims his father's special love for the sons of Rachel in begging for Benjamin's life, Fung condemns the Joseph story for finding *more* favoritism as the solution to the problems caused by favoritism.

This book can be read with great profit by all who would study the Joseph story. I am especially impressed with Fung's argument for the centrality of chap. 47 as part of the overall narrative structure. He is not alone in condemning the harsh cruelty of Joseph's enslaving the Egyptian people, but he has not established that the narrator shares this view. The weakest part of the book is therefore Fung's attempt to psychologize the protagonist as a 'tormented soul made wretched by his suffering in the pit' (198). For Fung Joseph is a 'sad figure' (198) whose perception of his past suffering is so flawed that he repeats and magnifies it into the enslavement of an entire people.

2714 Rock Creek Court
Bloomington, IN 47401 (USA)

James S. ACKERMAN

Novum Testamentum

John Paul HEIL, *The Transfiguration of Jesus*. Narrative Meaning and Function of Mark 9:2-8, Matt 17:1-8 and Luke 9:28-36 (AnBib 144). Roma, Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 2000. 367 p. 16,5 × 24. Lit. 45.000 – \$25.00 – €23,24

The title and subtitle of this meticulously argued book indicate its contents. Heil takes a narrative critical approach, so that each synoptic account of Jesus' transfiguration is treated in relation to the narrative that foregoes and follows it. Heil also uses reader response criticism, so that the question is constantly discussed: What meaning would original audiences attach to the transfiguration? Since presumably they did not compare the synoptics with each other, Q, M, or L, redaction criticism and the source criticism on which it is largely based go unused.

After an introductory chapter come chapters on the epiphanic genre of the transfiguration narrative, chapters on this and the surrounding narrative in each synoptic, a final chapter, a bibliography, and indexes. In addition to the summary that makes up the final chapter, each of the preceding chapters ends with a summary.

Heil notes and explains differences between the synoptic narratives but makes little of those differences. Emphasis therefore falls on shared features. Since the narratives are treated separately, this emphasis combines with the many summaries to produce considerable repetition.

In epiphanies, according to Heil, heavenly beings assume visible form on earth, as do Moses, Elijah, and Jesus. In theophanies, God is recognized by terrifying circumstances that accompany his coming to earth, but human beings do not see his actual figure. And in visions privileged human beings see supernatural phenomena, located mainly in heaven.

More particularly, the transfiguration is a mandatory epiphany in that it climaxes with a command to hear Jesus, and a pivotal epiphany in that the command refers to a topic of central importance in the broader narrative, the topic of Jesus' passion and resurrection as a pattern for Christian discipleship. Heil provides examples of other mandatory pivotal epiphanies granted to Balaam, Joshua, Heliodorus, and Peter.

Jesus' transfiguration enables him 'to appear and speak with the heavenly figures of Moses and Elijah ... and it points to Jesus' future and permanent attainment of glory in heaven' (26). The synoptists' audiences would understand the tents suggested by Peter (1) as celebratory and commemorative of God's salvific activity — like the tents in the Feast of Tabernacles; (2) as providing a place for heavenly beings to appear in glory and communicate with human beings — like the Tent of Meeting in the exodus period; and (3) as dwelling places for heavenly beings — like their dwelling places in heaven according to literature later than the OT.

The cloud at the transfiguration overshadowed only Moses and Elijah, because God's voice spoke 'out of' the cloud and told the disciples to hear Jesus, who therefore must also be located outside it. Thus, 'a cloud came and

was overshadowing them [Moses and Elijah]; and they [Peter, James, and John] were frightened as they [Moses and Elijah] entered into the cloud' (Luke 9,34). The cloud is oracular in that God speaks out of it, and vehicular in that it takes away Moses and Elijah.

Moses and Elijah were known to have attained heavenly glory without suffering a martyr's death. The point of the transfiguration lies, then, in a contrast between them and Jesus, who attains heavenly glory only after suffering such a death. So the command to hear Jesus refers to his predictions of passion and resurrection and to his associated calls that people take their crosses and follow him. Only then will they join him in attaining heavenly glory.

The narrative of transfiguration leaves the synoptists' audiences in suspense, however. Does the appearance of Moses and Elijah imply that like them Jesus will attain heavenly glory without dying a martyr's death? And as distinct from the crowd will the disciples truly hear his predictions and heed his call to cross-taking followership?

Here doubts begin to surface. Surely by now the synoptic narratives have established Jesus as a reliable character, so that audiences will hardly wait in suspense to see whether or not his predictions will reach fulfillment. And despite the disciples' dullness, Jesus' having chosen them and sent them on a Galilean mission would seem to put audience-suspense concerning them in some question.

In Mark the fear of Peter, James, and John at the transfiguration fits an epiphany; but in Matthew and Luke they succumb to fear not till God speaks out of the cloud, as in a theophany; and in all three synoptics the cloud's oracular function is theophanic. Heil himself compares the dazzling whiteness of Jesus' clothing and the brightness of his face to like phenomena in apocalyptic visions, and affirms that 'each of the heavenly figures [Jesus, Moses, and Elijah] ... is analogous to God, inasmuch as each appears in divine heavenly glory' (123). But only Luke has Moses and Elijah appear in glory.

Some of the parallels Heil draws between the transfiguration and OT epiphanies seem strained. For example, he says that just as the disappearance of Yahweh's angel in the epiphanies to Gideon and to Manoah and his wife issues in a recognition of the angel's true identity, 'so the three disciples are to know that the transfigured Jesus is God's beloved/chosen Son after Moses and Elijah disappear along with the overshadowing cloud, and Jesus alone is left there' (48-49). But for this parallel to work well, *Jesus* should disappear for his true identity to be recognized. One also wonders whether the synoptists' audiences associated the transfiguration with those OT epiphanies. An audience that had to have explained to them contemporary Jewish rituals of purification (Mark 7,3-4) seems unlikely to have made associations with obscure OT traditions. For the same reason one may suspect that Mark's audience might not detect a complex of allusions to the Tent of Meeting, the Feast of Tabernacles, and heavenly dwelling places, but might think simply of a prolongation of the transfiguration.

For his contrast between Moses' and Elijah's attaining heavenly glory without martyrdom and Jesus' attaining it only through martyrdom, Heil emphasizes that Moses and Elijah appeared from heaven. But heavenly origin

is not explicitly mentioned. It may be assumed, especially in Elijah's case because of his translation to heaven without dying; but the emphasis Heil puts on heavenly origin lacks support in the synoptic texts.

To strengthen the assumption of Moses' appearing from heaven, Heil appeals to traditions of Moses' translation, as opposed to the tradition of his death and burial. Traditions of translation are not to be denied, but Heil strains to strengthen his case by suggesting that according to *Liber antiquitatum biblicarum* 19,12.16 Moses entered heaven when he died even though the text asserts his remaining in the grave till the future resurrection. Why this suggestion? Because 'the angels ... went before him' (*L.A.B.* 19,12) 'in a kind of heavenly funeral procession' (so Heil, 107). But 'the heavenly hosts' of angels participate in a burial procession on earth; and the changing of Moses' appearance 'to a state of glory' refers to what happened prior to his dying, so that 'he *died* in glory', not that despite his burial he attained glory in heaven after dying (*L.A.B.* 19,16). In reference to *Ass. Mos.* 11,5-8 Heil strains again: 'the grave of Moses encompasses 'the entire world' (*omnis orbis terrarum*), which means it cannot be localized in any one place, giving it really an other-worldly or heavenly character' (110). But how can 'the entire world', which makes Moses' grave extend 'from the East to the West, and from the North to the extreme South' (*Ass. Mos.* 11,8), translate into something 'other-worldly or heavenly'?

Heil casts doubt on the three disciples' having heard the conversation of Elijah and Moses with Jesus in Mark 9,4-5; Matt 17,4. But Peter's 'answering' implies a hearing of the conversation better than a mere sighting of the transfiguration. And the later command to hear Jesus gains a sharper focus if the three disciples heard Moses and Elijah. If they did not, as rings true only in Luke (where the disciples sleep during the conversation), how easily can an audience think that Peter's proposal to build tents arose out of a desire 'to provide a tent, analogous to the Tent of Meeting, for each to continue his divine communication for the benefit of the three disciples' (161)? To infer that Peter has in mind an 'extending to the disciples the conversation that they see but do not hear taking place among the three heavenly figures' (149) demands subtle distinctions between seeing, not hearing, and wanting to hear.

Heil sees a purpose of the tents to 'commemorate what God has done in bringing about this marvelous manifestation ... analogous to the commemorative role of the tents at the Feast of Tabernacles' (314). But those tents harked back to an event long past. Here the event is taking place; so tents would hardly commemorate the occasion. And during Tabernacles the Israelites commemorated *their* dwelling in tents during the exodus period. Peter can hardly be understood to have in mind that Jesus, Moses, and Elijah would commemorate their dwelling in tents at an earlier time.

To say the cloud transported Moses and Elijah up to heaven leaves the question: How did they come to the mountain? No cloud brought them down from heaven, and there is no indication of vehicular movement up to heaven (contrast Dan 7,13; Mark 13,26 par.; 14,62 par.; Acts 1,9-11; 1 Thess 4,17; Rev 1,7; 11,12). Perhaps the cloud is only oracular. And Heil's denial that according to Matt 17,11 Elijah is yet to come requires the unlikely view that the Baptist 'restored all things'.

Heil closes his discussion of the Lukan pericope with the statement: 'Only by truly listening to Jesus will they [the three disciples] be able to break their silence and report in the days to come what they have experienced in the transfiguration epiphany' (279). But Luke has omitted Jesus' gag order that they are to observe till the resurrection; and before the Sanhedrin — therefore before the resurrection — Jesus himself will publicize his divine sonship and glorious future. As W. Wrede commented: 'If the meaning of the Transfiguration was to be discerned only later, then it seems more or less harmless if people heard about it earlier' (*The Messianic Secret* [Cambridge 1971] 67).

To make the point that Jesus' death and resurrection are required for the disciples to understand the transfiguration, Heil presses the disciples' non-understanding in Matthew too far. To Matthew's straightforward statements in 16,12 and 17,13: 'Then they/the disciples understood', he adds the rider, 'in both cases the disciples' understanding is only partial and creates a deeper suspense regarding what they still do not understand' (229). About 17,13 he says 'there is no indication that they understand that Jesus must suffer and die before being raised to the heavenly glory they saw in the transfigured Jesus' (230). But in 17,4-5 Matthew omitted Peter's ignorance (contrast Mark 9,6; Luke 9,33). The great sadness of the disciples in Matt 17,22-23 implies their understanding Jesus' prediction of passion and resurrection. Heil denies an understanding of the resurrection and makes the sadness a sign of the disciples' 'little faith' (17,20). But their little faith has to do with exorcistic inability in a different pericope. And why not sadness because of a passion that makes a just-as-well understood resurrection necessary?

Besides, Heil's thesis of a contrast between glorification without a prior death by violence and glorification only after such a death would seem to require the disciples' ignorance of Jesus' coming passion more than of his coming resurrection. Heil's argument from silence (234, 240) — viz., that the disciples' non-response to predictions of Jesus' death and resurrection in Matt 20,17-19; 26,2.12 indicates their failure to understand — is reversible: the non-response may equally well indicate understanding. James' and John's declaration that they are able to drink Jesus' cup (20,28) and all the disciples' protesting their willingness to die with Jesus (26,35) seem to presume an understanding.

Certainly the disciples do not understand in Luke (see esp. 24,25-27), but Heil need not have drawn a contrast with Mary's listening to Jesus' word (Luke 10,39), as though she 'is in a position to understand the necessity of Jesus' journey to suffer and die in Jerusalem' (288). There is nothing in this pericope about the passion and resurrection, and the word of Jesus in the surrounding pericopes deals with love and prayer. Since he does not pray for his disciples in Gethsemane, it is mystifying why Heil refers to 'the importance and power of Jesus' praying for them' there, and to his praying for them as empowering them to 'go together [with him] to play their respective roles in God's plan' (192-193).

The disciples' seeing the risen Jesus in Galilee according to Mark and Matthew, says Heil, gives a further fulfillment — beyond the transfiguration — of Jesus' prediction in Mark 9,1; Matt 16,28 that some standing there would not taste death till they had seen God's kingdom as having come with power, or the Son of Man coming in his kingdom. Mark has a crowd as well

as the disciples standing there, so that the eleven who are to see the risen Jesus in Galilee can count as 'some'. But in Matthew only the disciples are standing there, so that later the eleven could count as 'some' only by the subtraction of Judas Iscariot. Even in Mark the noting of a mere week that separated the transfiguration from the prediction would probably make an audience rest satisfied with the transfiguration as a fulfillment.

Heil makes so many appeals to word-usage in other parts of Mark, Matthew, and Luke, and in the OT, that the danger of 'illegitimate totality transfer' is ever present. And his use of reader response criticism might well have led him to use source and redaction criticisms as well, for under the usual view Matthew and Luke provide our first evidence of readers' responses to Mark. Some striking 'minor' agreements of Matthew and Luke against Mark offer further avenues of exploration, such as Luke's reader response to Matthew or to pre-Matthean tradition. Because of the many parallels between Luke and Acts, the possibility of an influence of Luke's version of the transfiguration on Acts (i.e., Luke's response to his own version of the transfiguration) might also be explored profitably — and the possibility of another reader's response in echoes of the transfiguration in the Fourth Gospel. Heil's ability to detect echoes, though sometimes overdone, would suit him admirably to undertake such explorations. And despite the doubts expressed in this review, the thesis of the work that he has done on the transfiguration deserves serious consideration

Westmont College
955 La Paz Road
Santa Barbara, CA 93108 (USA)

Robert H. GUNDRY

Klaus SCHOLTISSEK, *In Ihm Sein und Bleiben*. Die Sprache der Immanenz in den johanneischen Schriften (Herders biblische Studien 21). Freiburg, Herder, 2000. xi-436 p. 16 × 24,5. DM 98 – ÖS 715 – SFr 93 – Euro 50,11.

El trabajo de K. Scholtissek es una tesis doctoral, presentada y defendida en la Facultad de Teología de la Julius-Maximilians-Universität de Würzburg en el año 1999. El contenido de la misma se divide en seis apartados de longitud desigual. El primero (A; 1-6) justifica el tema y describe el camino seguido en el trabajo. El segundo (B; 7-22) valora las diversas interpretaciones del lenguaje de la immanencia en la exégesis reciente (y lo hace por contenidos temáticos más que por autores, p. ej., immanencia como unidad, como obediencia del agente enviado, como fidelidad, como amor, como mística, como participar en la vida de Dios, etc.). El tercer apartado (C; 23-130) es un estudio comparativo del uso del lenguaje de la immanencia en el mundo cultural del evangelio de Juan: (C.II) en la historia de la filosofía y de la religión de la antigüedad (Platón, Aristóteles; el monismo estoico; Plutarco, Plotino y la religión de los misterios); (C.III) Las formulaciones gnósticas de

la inmanencia (Nag Hammadi; Odas de Salomón; Corpus hermeticum); (C.IV) en la tradición bíblica AT (Hebreo); Septuaginta y Aquila; en los escritos del judaísmo primitivo (Testamentos de los XII Patriarcas; tradición sapiencial; Qumrán; Filón; Flavio Josefo; misticismo judío). (C.V) ofrece una visión del conjunto del vasto campo analizado. Se subraya que la cercanía verbal muchas veces no corresponde a la cercanía de contenido. Hasta aquí puntos de partida y puntos de referencia.

El apartado siguiente (D; 131-140) ofrece el instrumento fundamental de la tesis: se argumenta (siguiendo modelos propuestos por la exégesis reciente, p. ej. J. Zumstein y A. Dettweiler) que los paradigmas reescritura y relectura, sin dejar de lado las aportaciones de los métodos histórico-críticos, ofrecen un modelo de desarrollo progresivo que parece presidió la progresiva elaboración del evangelio según Juan y las cartas de dicha escuela.

Viene, a continuación, el trabajo nuclear de la tesis (E; 141-362). Después de ofrecer una estadística de los usos de la preposición ἐν (y de otras preposiciones en el NT) y de las expresiones μένειν, μένειν ἐν (NT), se presenta su utilización en el Corpus Johanneum. Y se subraya que el campo de la metáfora del μένειν se alarga también a expresiones como σκηνοῦν, οἰκεῖν, κατοικεῖν, οἰκία, οἰκία y λαμβάνειν; pero también a expresiones como conocer, amar, glorificar. Esta panorámica permite constatar que el lenguaje de inmanencia no sólo no es un cuerpo extraño en el Corpus Johanneum sino que crece al amparo del potencial lingüístico y teológico de la dinámica de pensamiento joánico, que está íntimamente enlazado con éste y puede ser un fruto maduro de la reflexión joánica (E.I; 141-174).

A continuación (E.II-VII) viene el análisis e interpretación de diversos textos de la tradición joánica: el prólogo como metatexto de la teología joánica de la inmanencia (174-194); la eucaristía y la inmanencia (análisis de Jn 6: 194-210); un detallado análisis de las formulaciones de inmanencia del primer discurso de despedida, 13,31-14,31 (210-274); la profundización de la teología de la inmanencia en Jn 15,1-17 (275-316); el estudio del tema inmanencia y unidad (Jn 10 y Jn 17, 317-339). Este núcleo central de la tesis se cierra con un análisis bastante pormenorizado de la 1 Jn como relectura del evangelio (340-362).

El último apartado (F; 363-380) presenta los resultados del trabajo en tres bloques: (1) por lo que se refiere al contexto (*Sitz im Leben*), Jn 13-17 (el lugar de mayor concentración de la teología de la inmanencia) es el reflejo de una situación post-pascual de la comunidad joánica. En ella se percibe una nueva presencia de Jesús, fruto de la acción del Espíritu. Los textos clave de esta nueva presencia hacen referencia al recuerdo y a la reflexión de la comunidad (cf. 2,17.22; 7,39; 14,16-17.26; 15,7; 16,12-15). (2) Sobre el contenido programático de la teología de la inmanencia. El núcleo fundamental de esta teología apunta a una profunda visión del misterio de Jesús, que ofrece la mejor base de la posterior teología trinitaria. Pero sus implicaciones eclesiales, sacramentales y éticas son también subrayadas. (3) Inmanencia y experiencia de la fe. La teología de la inmanencia de los escritos joánicos presupone una experiencia de fe y una experiencia de Dios. Esta teología intenta verbalizar estas experiencias de forma que puedan ser ofrecidas a los futuros lectores como indicador mistagógico hacia una experiencia de plenitud mediada por el Espíritu.

El resumen que ofrecemos, con ser bastante detallado, no pretende de forma alguna hacer justicia a una multitud de matices y de aportaciones que resulta casi inabarcable. La familiaridad de K. Scholtissek con la exégesis joánica es uno de los datos que más sobresalen en su obra. No sólo en el texto de la misma sino en las múltiples referencias a publicaciones suyas que, sin duda, matizan y completan los muchos aspectos tratados. Con el peligro de ser muy subjetivo, voy a destacar cuatro aspectos que considero verdaderas aportaciones de la obra de Scholtissek. Después me detendré un poco más en aspectos que pueden resultar más abiertos y que, por tanto, se prestan a una valoración más crítica.

(1) Al tratarse de una tesis doctoral, la elección del tema es un primer acierto que hay que subrayar. El recorrido que hace el autor en el apartado B (7-22) sitúa al lector/a ante un tema que no ha sido suficientemente estudiado (a pesar de que algunas monografías hayan tratado algunos aspectos con acierto: p. ej. la monografía de M.L. Appold sobre el motivo de la unidad [8], la de J.A. Bühner sobre el tema del agente-enviado como clave de la cristología [9], la de J. Heise sobre μένειν [10]; otros han hecho referencia al tema dentro de sus comentarios: R. Schnackenburg [7-8] y H.-J. Klauck [14-15]). El último párrafo de este apartado B resulta una excelente justificación de la tesis.

(2) Hay un apartado del trabajo de K. Scholtissek que merece ser subrayado: el capítulo C sobre el contexto filosófico-religioso del tema (23-130). Se trata de una aportación muy pormenorizada, que tiene la pretensión de ofrecer un punto de referencia no sólo a las fórmulas de inmanencia del Corpus joánico sino a un amplio sector de textos del NT (el autor cita la célebre fórmula paulina ἐν Χριστῷ [1, n. 3; 142, n. 12]). Precisamente por esta pretensión, resulta interesante que las conclusiones de la obra sobre la independencia literaria del Corpus joánico (369) confirman plenamente lo que los análisis literarios del apartado C ya insinuaban (24.126-130).

(3) Los paradigmas de relectura y reescritura constituyen la base del trabajo y son una muestra de la familiaridad de K. Scholtissek con la exégesis joánica de nuestros días. El primero se define como “un proceso de maduración que se debe fundamentalmente a un desarrollo progresivo de la fe cristológica y que está condicionado por las circunstancias propias y sociales de la comunidad, tanto internas como externas” (132). Se sigue el modelo utilizado por A. Dettweiler en su obra sobre los discursos de despedida joánicos (*Die Gegenwart des Erhöhten* [FRLANT 16; Göttingen 1995]): “*organischer Fortschreibungsprozess*” (el subrayado es del autor; *ibid.*). El ejemplo de Jn 9, que parte de una narración de curación y se alarga tanto con la cuestión sobre el *šabbāt* como en la discusión con la sinagoga sobre el mesianismo de Jesús y se cierra con la automanifestación de Jesús, constituye un modelo de lo que el autor considera el proceso de redacción progresiva del evangelio según Juan (133). La descripción del método lleva a Scholtissek a definirlo como: “*Selbstauslegung und Selbstaktualisierung des erhöhten Christus ... ein geistinspirierter Vorgang*” (el subrayado es del autor; 134).

Si la relectura tiende a explicar la correlación diacrónica de los textos joánicos, en cambio la reescritura es una “*variierende Wiederaufnahme und vielschichtige Um-Schreibung ein und derselben Grundkonstellation durch den gleichen Autor*” (el subrayado es del autor; 137). La hipótesis es que el

evangelio según Juan reescribe en cada escena el núcleo fundamental de su mensaje. Es como un evangelio en el evangelio (139). El tema se anuncia en la primera aparición del Bautista: “en medio de vosotros está aquél a quien no conocéis” (Jn 1,26).

Considero que ambos esquemas constituyen una hipótesis de lectura e interpretación plenamente legítima. En cualquier caso son una concreción válida del carácter profundamente hermenéutico que empapa todo el texto del evangelio según Juan (véanse, por ejemplo, las citas de J. Moloney y de U. Schnelle en 132 n. 6). Y son una forma de hacerse eco de una afirmación central, que no sorprenderá a quienes estén familiarizados con la exégesis de los últimos decenios: “Der Vers 16,13 ‘lässt sich durchaus als Schlüssel für das Selbstverständnis des gesamten Werks begreifen’” (con cita de J. Gnllka, 135).

(4) El análisis del prólogo como metatexto constituye, para mí, uno de los apartados más sugerentes del trabajo (174-194). La individuación del eje semántico (recibir, acoger = λαμβάνειν, παραλαμβάνειν) resulta notablemente acertada y se constituye en punto de referencia de todo el trabajo (179-184.193-194.235-236, véase sobre todo 180 n. 250 y 225 n. 476). La propuesta de la metáfora familiar como eje metafórico o como metáfora básica (371) del evangelio no sólo es sugerente sino que tiene además la virtud de relacionar textos aparentemente inconexos del mismo (p. ej. 8,32-59 y 13,31-14,31) y enlaza espléndidamente con la estructura familiar de las comunidades joánicas (374).

Creo que estas dos propuestas son una aportación notablemente interesante del presente trabajo y la exégesis joánica quedará sin duda enriquecida con este paso adelante. En primer lugar porque anclan la teología joánica en la relación paterno-filial de Jesús y el Padre que, sin duda, constituye el núcleo fundamental del evangelio. Pero, además, no sólo dan el talante fundamental del tema de la tesis sino que son también una referencia — al menos implícita — al *milieu* en que se gestaron estas obras (evangelio y cartas).

Hasta aquí unos aspectos que considero verdaderas aportaciones de K. Scholtissek. Voy a entresacar algunos temas que no afectan substancialmente a la tesis central de la obra pero que, según mi parecer, son aspectos más abiertos. Voy a centrarme en tres observaciones y un último apartado de cuestiones menores.

Como ya hemos indicado, los paradigmas de relectura y reescritura son una referencia clave en la interpretación de Juan según Scholtissek. Si he comprendido bien su propuesta, se trata por una parte de una progresiva profundización en una relectura de la tradición (por lo que parece de textos fundamentalmente narrativos (ejemplo de Jn 9 y 11 en 133-134, sería el aspecto diacrónico) y por otra de retomar núcleos discursivos (ejemplos de Jn 1; 6; 10; 14 en 138) y de reelaborarlos en función de una progresiva explicitación del mensaje central (sería el aspecto sincrónico). Se parte, por tanto, de un núcleo central (el evangelio dentro del evangelio) que en un caso (relectura) actúa como catalizador de la tradición y que en otro (reescritura) amplía y explicita algunos discursos de Jesús.

Las preguntas que uno se hace aquí son: ¿En qué consiste este núcleo central? ¿Qué aspectos de la tradición joánica abarca? ¿Cómo se combinan

aquí imágenes cristológicas tan dispares como el hijo enviado y el hijo del hombre? Este evangelio dentro del evangelio ¿es una cristología de la encarnación o una cristología de la exaltación? Este punto no se resuelve con una referencia a la sacramentología (“Die joh Christologie denkt inkarnatorisch [mit Einschluss der Todeshingabe], die joh Sakramenten-theologie von der Auferstehung her”, 202) porque la sacramentología es esencialmente cristológica, ¿o es que se trata más bien de una única cristología que tiene dos polos (R. Schnackenburg, retomado por W. Thüsing)? Pienso que este aspecto queda muy poco explicitado en los detallados análisis de Scholtissek. Soy muy consciente de que esta cuestión resulta notablemente difícil de explicitar, y que probablemente yo tampoco sabría contestarla satisfactoriamente. Pero lo que quiero subrayar es que la fe de la comunidad, que parece ser el núcleo que hace avanzar literariamente el evangelio, a mí se me antoja más un fruto de todo el trabajo de relectura y de reescritura que un punto de partida. Es verdad que Scholtissek habla de una necesidad intrínseca de desarrollo teológico de la fe que no contradiga el estricto monoteísmo judío (“Entfaltungsbedürftigkeit des christlichen Glauben selbst”, 136, n. 26, con referencia a H. Weder y también en 363-364). Pero lo que no acaba de quedar claro es si esta fe es fruto o más bien punto de partida del trabajo literario. Para decirlo llanamente: es la tradición la que lleva a la fe o es más bien la fe la que relea la tradición.

En el fondo es la cuestión perenne de la relación entre tradición narrativa y discursos en el evangelio. Creo que la solución de la relectura y la reescritura no acaba de resolver esta cuestión de forma satisfactoria. Porque se mezclan cuestiones teológicas (lo que Scholtissek llama ‘evangelio dentro del evangelio’) y cuestiones literarias: la forma como se ha ido elaborando el evangelio según Juan. Creo que la hipótesis de relectura y de reescritura responde al talante hermenéutico del evangelio, pero no acaba de explicar satisfactoriamente el proceso de elaboración literaria del mismo.

La segunda observación crítica está íntimamente enlazada con la cuestión anterior. Es el tema de la experiencia de la fe. El autor anuncia este tema al comienzo (6) y lo retoma en las conclusiones (377-380). En el cuerpo de la obra lo trata en la medida que el eje semántico viene a ser definido como “ser acogido” (179-184; 193-194). El tratamiento del tema es sugerente y, como he dicho antes, constituye un eje central, tanto del evangelio como del trabajo de Scholtissek. Pero el contenido de esta experiencia (fundamental para la tesis del autor) no resulta ulteriormente clarificado. Y, en el fondo, es el punto más importante del trabajo. Ahora bien, es notorio que la experiencia de la fe joánica no es el objeto de la exposición del evangelio: como nos recordó el comentario póstumo de E. Haenchen, a menudo pasamos por alto que, en la narración joánica, nadie llega a creer verdaderamente en él (cf. 12,37-43 y 16,32-33). La fe joánica es una fe dogmática (como subrayó enfáticamente Käsemann contra su maestro Bultmann). Pero entonces, el tema de la experiencia de la fe sólo se puede explicitar en la medida que es una necesaria implicación de la fe dogmática. Y, en este sentido, como subraya el autor, creer es ser acogido, ser conducido y ser engendrado. Pero estas categorías tienen una prioridad cristológica que hacen muy compleja la explicitación antropológica del camino de la fe. Porque si bien el evangelio parece describir la fe como un ir a Jesús, en cambio este ir a Jesús es interpretado como un ser

atraído por el mismo Jesús (cf. 12,32); si por una parte se dice que creer es comprender, por otra el comprender, visto en profundidad, es ser enseñado (6,45; cf. 14,26); si creer es, en el fondo, amar (cf. 1 Jn), en cambio en el fondo amar es, sobre todo, ser amado (13,34-35). En una palabra la misma experiencia del creer resulta que es interpretada desde la iniciativa de Dios. Como lo es la Cristología. La complementariedad de las cartas juega aquí un papel relevante y la exigencia ética a la que apelan resulta un aspecto importante, correctamente subrayado por el autor. Pero no acaban de explicar el sentido de la experiencia de la fe según el evangelio, que continúa siendo poco explícito en la presentación del autor.

La interpretación de la escatología de Jn 14,2-3 (249-253.261) resulta poco convincente. El autor no parece que quiera aplicar aquí la fusión de tiempos que considera importante en la interpretación del evangelio (cita de J. Bühner en 4; referencias en 243 y 370). Creo que la interpretación de G. Fischer y de R. Schnackenburg (que el autor ciertamente tiene en cuenta, 250) es más consonante con la compleja escatología del evangelio (que, como es sabido, nos acerca más a la protología que a una escatología apocalíptica). Pero, además, el interés del autor de leer una escatología de futuro en Jn 14,2-3 le impide valorar una frase bastante importante para su tesis. Jesús dice en este texto: ... ἵνα ὅπου εἶμι ἐγὼ καὶ ὑμεῖς ἦτε (14,3). Esta frase (ὅπου εἶμι ἐγὼ) es fundamental no sólo para valorar la escatología presente sino porque se repite en textos clave del evangelio (p. ej. 7,34.36; 12,26; 14,3; 17,24, los tres primeros textos ni aparecen en el índice de lugares bíblicos citados por el autor) y hace del “lugar” de Jesús más un lugar teologal que una ubicación topográfica. Jesús, como subraya el mismo autor, está siempre vuelto hacia el seno del Padre (cf. 1,18 y 1,1). Cuando este misterio se hace presente, aparecen la plenitud y la verdad (cf. 1,17). Categorías como el “último día” no son capaces de incidir en un esquema teológico tan profundo, aunque tengan su papel en la visión joánica.

Algunas observaciones más de detalle. Por ejemplo, la opción por algunas lecturas en textos que resultan importantes. Me ha sorprendido que se opte por la lectura larga de Jn 8,34 (245), texto tan enlazado con el tema de la casa-familia de 8,35: ¿qué sentido tiene, desde el punto de vista joánico, hablar del esclavo del pecado? La imagen es la del hijo que está en la casa para siempre y la del esclavo que no está en la casa para siempre. También considero importante que ni siquiera se mencione la variante de presente para 14,17 (214-215). Creo que hubiera sido interesante hacer referencia a la traducción de los LXX de Ex 23,21 (81). Hay alguna expresión subrayada por el autor que no aparece luego en los índices temáticos y que, en cambio, parece que podría ser objeto de mayor atención. Por ejemplo: “pragmatische Intention des JohEv” [183], ¿se refiere a T. Onuki, a quien cita, o más bien a W.A. Meeks, a quien no cita?. La palabra “mystagogisch” [379]: creo que esta formulación es excesivamente elíptica. La expresión “Verschmelzung der Zeiten” [243, 370] es una cosa, en cambio las analepsis y las prolepsis a las que hace referencia en otros lugares (p. ej. 248) parece ser otra. En cualquier caso creo que, a pesar de la familiaridad de la exégesis con la fusión de tiempos, hubiera sido bueno explicar qué entiende el autor por esta caracterización.

Probablemente algunas de mis observaciones quedarían matizadas si

estuviera familiarizado con la notable producción de K. Scholtissek que, como ya he insinuado, tiene 26 entradas en la Bibliografía. Sobre todo por lo que hace referencia al Sitz im Leben del evangelio y de las cartas (cf. la conclusión, 374). Ésta ha sido una cuestión que me ha acompañado a lo largo de la lectura de la obra y que me hubiera gustado ver un poco más explicitada de lo que el autor ha considerado necesario. En cualquier caso quiero acabar felicitando al autor por su notable contribución a los estudios joánicos. Sobre todo porque en muchos aspectos he encontrado claras confirmaciones a una percepción que, globalmente, comparto en casi todo.

Avda. Drassanes, 27, entl. 5^a
E-08001 Barcelona

Josep Oriol TUÑÍ, s.j.

Justin TAYLOR, *Les Actes des deux apôtres*. IV. Commentaire historique (Act. 1,1–8,40). Paris, Éditions J. Gabalda, 2000. xxxii-245p. 16 × 24. FF 190.

Although this is an historical commentary on Acts 1–8 and is number IV in the series *Les Actes des deux apôtres* i.e. The canonical Acts of the Apostles which combines the sources concerning *la geste* of Peter and *la geste* of Paul, it is in fact the sixth in this series and the final part of a commentary that is based on Boismard and Lamouille's edition of two texts of Acts: M.-É. Boismard and A. Lamouille, *Le texte occidental des Actes des Apôtres: Reconstitution et réhabilitation* (Recherche sur les grandes Civilisations. Synthèse 17; Paris 1984). Vol. IV and Vol. V have an unfortunate division as the commentary on the work of Peter (one of the deux apôtres of the title) is obviously not confined to only these first eight chapters.

Le texte occidental was published in two volumes in 1984 as a prelude to a literary study of Acts. The six volumes that followed are all in the monograph series *Études bibliques* (ÉB hereafter) and are based on Boismard's work on the pre-history of Acts. We are familiar with Boismard's work on the supposed literary sources of the Gospel of John and more recently of Ephesians. As always, his work is painstaking, provocative and imaginative but his views on Acts have failed to impress many scholars, mainly because the results are often too speculative and because he has felt obliged to explain and show with excessive intricacy how every verse and half verse evolved over several stages. In the case of Acts he has pointed out to us three main stages; the primitive text, which drew on certain documents, then a reworking of this by Luke and then a third post-Lukan revision. These three are to be detected in and behind Boismard's Western and Alexandrian texts.

The first three supplementary volumes were written by Boismard and Lamouille. These are: I: Introduction – Textes (ÉB 12; 1990); II: Le sens des récits (ÉB 13; 1990); III: Analyses littéraires (ÉB 14; 1990). Having thus cleared the literary questions, the historic commentary began with

volume V on Acts 9–18,22 (ÉB 23; 1994) and was followed by VI on Acts 18,23–end (ÉB 30; 1996). Now comes vol. IV (ÉB 41). These historical commentaries have all been entrusted to Boismard's colleague at the École biblique, Justin Taylor, who wrote them in English and had them translated into French by Boismard. Sometimes the literary changes argued for in these volumes are said to be the result of changes within the developing church. Thus literary and historical criticism cannot be kept in watertight compartments. As a result Taylor sometimes has nothing new to say in his 'historical' comments. For example, in volume IV page 74 he has nothing further to add to what has already appeared in vols. I, II and III.

So, Taylor has been intimately involved with Boismard's thinking on Acts, although he can occasionally disagree with Boismard and Lamouille's text of 1984. This can be seen in the present volume in the discussion about the passages in Acts 2,37–47 concerning Christian baptism. Boismard-Lamouille were inclined (III, p. 135) to attribute all such references to their second stage in the development of the primitive history of the book, namely the editing by Luke. Taylor is hesitant about accepting that view (p. 81). Elsewhere he keeps a distance by prefacing his remarks with 'Selon les analyses de Boismard-Lamouille...' and the like.

Unfortunately for Taylor, the goalposts have been moved since the publication of vol. VI. The two types of text which Boismard and Lamouille labelled TA, being their reconstruction of an Alexandrian text, and TO, their reconstruction of the Western Text, in their 1984 book have changed. In 2000 Boismard published *Le texte occidental des Actes des Apôtres: Édition nouvelle entièrement refondue* (ÉB 40), in which are to be found several differences from the text previously printed and until then the one used as the basis for the literary and historical commentaries! Taylor refers to the change in the underlying base text in his Avant-Propos but makes light of it, merely noting that these changes will have an impact on the previous studies. In a preface to the revised text volume Boismard refers to hostile criticism of his 1984 book. (He fails to include critical reviews by J.N. Birdsall in *JTS* and by Frans Neirynck in *ETL*.) Scholarly opinion has not mellowed since the publication of the first volume in 1984, and that is another problem inherited by Taylor — he is battling with an underlying text (changed or not) that has not been accepted by the scholarly world. In an attempt to show that this work has inspired others, Taylor points to Paul Tavardon's work on Boismard and Lamouille's text (now published in *Cahiers de la Revue Biblique* 44 in 1999) but avoids referring us to Jenny Read-Heimerdinger's verdict in her review in *NovT* XLI (1999) 392–395 that Tavardon's work is flawed, precisely because it is based on a hypothetical text.

In any case, these studies are difficult to get a handle on. Unlike conventional commentaries which treat the text as a whole — textual, literary and historical — in a verse by verse progression through the book, these volumes in this series require one to have several volumes open simultaneously, the original text types, the revised text types, volumes I, II and III as well as the relevant volume of the historical commentary. Sometimes, as we have noted, there are disagreements. Taylor in V page x thought that he could repeat sufficient of earlier discussions to make it

unnecessary to make reference to these other volumes, but my experience with the historical commentaries makes it necessary to keep making cross references. As far as the present volume is concerned, if I wish to read about Pentecost I turn to pages 55-78 then I consult volume II, 98-101, and III, 45-49, while keeping an eye on the texts of TA and TO!

In addition, one is always up against the cyclic argument, namely that these studies are intended to 'prove' the validity of the reconstituted Western text, a text which itself feeds the commentary. Also the literary analysis influences the historical and vice versa.

The whole enterprise here is really "work in progress" and it would be charitable to view it in that light. The revised textual basis is evidence of ongoing research and thinking. The need to review and keep reviewing the results drawn from that text will keep its authors busy, but until the basic thesis of the history of the text convinces more scholars, the exercise is likely to be self-indulgent. This is unfortunate because the reader who has the energy to work with these volumes will find much to stimulate and inform him.

University of Leeds
School of Theology,
University of Leeds,
Leeds LS2 9JT (UK)

James Keith ELLIOTT

Simon LÉGASSE *L'épître de Paul aux Galates* (Lectio Divina Commentaires 9). Paris, Les Éditions du Cerf, 2000. 496 p. 13,5 × 21. FF 275

Para quien tiene que leer de corrido un comentario bíblico — tarea a la verdad pesada algunas veces — resulta gratificante encontrarse con uno de ellos como el que presento aquí. Es un trabajo que no está obsesionado con determinados métodos que ha de aplicar a toda costa, sino que se encuentra en la línea de los llamados comentarios clásicos, con un cierto eclecticismo en cuanto a la metodología. Así emplea, por ejemplo, los resultados del análisis sociológico (38-41), además de usar los métodos más extendidos. La obra se sitúa en la línea de otros comentarios precedentes del mismo autor (p. ej. S. Légasse, *Les Épîtres de Paul aux Thessaloniens* [LDC 7; Paris 1999]).

L. no cae en la tentación de ser original a toda costa — lo que en ocasiones hace que algunos autores propongan exégesis, por decir poco, "curiosas" o "extravagantes" — sino que pone al lector al corriente de los avances que la interpretación más reciente ha ido haciendo acerca de este escrito paulino. Prueba de ello es la abundante y actualizada bibliografía que aparece al final de cada una de las secciones, donde el interesado lector puede ampliar cuanto el comentarista ha dicho de forma más breve en su exposición. Es de agradecer que el autor utilice bibliografía en lenguas como el castellano, italiano o catalán, en lugar de ceñirse, como ocurre tan

frecuentemente sólo a los tradicionales, inglés, francés y alemán. Ello amplía y enriquece la perspectiva.

Además de las aportaciones señaladas L. ofrece también su propia postura sobre puntos debatidos y tal postura resulta original y novedosa. Se preocupa fundamentalmente por los contenidos “teológicos” de la carta más que por puntos más secundarios, interesantes desde luego, pero que resultan menos relevantes para muchos lectores.

En este sentido no es en absoluto inútil la aparición de otro comentario a Gálatas, pues es evidente que la ciencia bíblica, como las demás, avanza y no es posible limitarse a posturas sólidas y aceptadas.

Esta apreciación positiva del comentario no implica que acepte todas y cada una de las afirmaciones que en él se hacen. Hago, pues, algunas observaciones críticas con ánimo de que sean discutidas, si vale la pena.

Siguiendo fundamentalmente el orden del libro y de la carta, no el de la importancia de los temas, en primer lugar he de mencionar que resulta discutible el colocar el segundo viaje misional de Pablo, el de la predicación en Galacia Norte, antes de la reunión de Jerusalén de Act 15 (34). Esta postura ya había sido defendida por L. en obras anteriores (*Thessaloniens*, 38-40; *Paul apôtre. Essai de biographie critique* [Paris 1991] 88-90). Pero, aun reconociendo que el punto no está resuelto definitivamente, los argumentos aportados no parecen del todo convincentes para modificar la opinión más comúnmente aceptada acerca de la cronología de esos viajes. Es, en cambio, poco discutible la datación de la carta hacia el año 56 (36) o quizás ligeramente antes, probablemente en Macedonia, en lo cual coincide con otros investigadores (cf. p. ej. J.J. Bartolomé, *Pablo de Tarso* [Claves cristianas 7; Madrid 1997] 225; A. Pitta, *Lettera ai Galati* [SOCr 9; Bologna 1996] 34, curiosamente no citada por L. en su bibliografía; en contra, B. Witherington III, *Grace in Galatia* [Grand Rapids 1998] 12).

Pasando a otros temas más profundos. Estoy de acuerdo con el significado soteriológico que L. expone sobre la partícula ὑπερ (53), pero no tanto con la interpretación de la muerte de Cristo con un sacrificio expiatorio, lo que aparece varias veces a lo largo del comentario (52-53, 199, 234). Ya hace tiempo autores como X. Léon-Dufour (*Jesús y Pablo ante la muerte* [AcChr 16; Madrid 1982] 197-203) o P. Grelot (“Le repas seigneurial (1 Co 11,20s)”, *La Pâque du Christ, Mystère de salut* (FS. F.-X. Durrwell [ed. M. Benzerath et al.] LD 112; Paris 1982] 222), por citar sólo algún nombre relevante, han hecho críticas válidas sobre la identificación de la muerte de Jesucristo con una concepción sacrificial en la obra paulina, críticas que comparto (F. Pastor Ramos, *La salvación del hombre en la muerte y resurrección de Cristo* [Institución San Jerónimo 24; Estella 1991] 68-74), sin que posteriormente se hayan rebatido tales posiciones. Si la base principal para esa concepción es la terminología del ὑπερ, es preciso completarla, para que sea aceptable, con un examen global de la postura paulina sobre lo sacrificial, especialmente con Rom 3,25-26, dada la ambigüedad que la fórmula “por” tiene (cf. Pastor Ramos, *La salvación*, 16-23) y que L. parece compartir.

En el actual contexto de los debates acerca de la ley en Pablo (E.P. Sanders, Räisanen...) son de mucho interés las reflexiones de L. sobre este punto (215-219). Si comprendo bien cuanto dice, no se trata de una

minusvaloración directa de la Torah por parte de Pablo, sino que parte de la experiencia de Cristo, y Éste resucitado, que el Apóstol ha tenido en su vida a partir de la inicial de su conversión: “pour Paul, la mutation s’imposait comme une évidence en raison d’une expérience [...] du stade actuel et terminal de l’histoire de Dieu avec les hommes” (218-219). Considero esencial la insistencia en la perspectiva cristológica/soteriológica paulina a fin de comprender su postura acerca de la economía legal.

A este propósito, en cambio, no estoy tan de acuerdo con el considerar que la muerte de Jesús no fue una condena hecha en nombre de la ley (191-192). Es cierto que Pablo no afirma nunca directamente que los responsables de la muerte de Cristo lo hayan hecho de ese modo. Pero la “maldición” de Gal 3,13 está muy cerca de ello (*pace* H. Räisänen, *Paul and the Law* [WUNT 29; Tübingen 1983] 58). Es difícil pensar que Pablo no estuviera al corriente de las tradiciones que desembocan en las narraciones evangélicas sobre la condena por parte del Sanedrín que, ella sí, se hace con la ley en la mano (cf. Jn 19,7). En efecto, Pablo sabe que “los señores de este mundo” crucificaron al Señor de la gloria (1 Cor 2,8), lo cual verosímilmente ha de referirse a los responsables de la muerte de Cristo entre los que se cuentan los representantes de la ley (cf. 1 Tes 2,15). Realmente la argumentación paulina sobre la liberación de la ley operada en la muerte y resurrección se comprende más fácilmente considerando tal muerte como algo relacionado con la ley (cf. F. Pastor Ramos, *Pablo, un seducido por Cristo* [Estella 1991] 66).

Hay, finalmente, algunos puntos de menor importancia, como el lapsus de decir (144) que el único “Jacques” en el colegio de los Doce es el hijo del Zebedeo o la tendencia a una cierta actitud apologetica de las posturas paulinas en algunos temas como p. ej. la esclavitud (279-281), aunque L. reconozca las limitaciones paulinas consideradas desde una perspectiva más moderna.

Todo ello, sin embargo, no empaña en absoluto el valor de la obra que he comentado y por la cual felicito al autor — en realidad ello no es necesario — y a la ciencia bíblica actual.

Fernando el Católico, 63 6º D
E-28015 Madrid

Federico PASTOR RAMOS

Abraham J. MALHERBE, *The Letters to the Thessalonians. A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AncB 32B). New York, Doubleday, 2000. xx-508 p. 16 x 24. \$50.00 – Can\$75.00

All those interested in Scripture will applaud the appearance of 1 and 2 Thessalonians in the prestigious Anchor Bible series, a series which has already begun to replace first editions of some NT commentaries. This major volume — the mature result after a long incubation period — is presented with utmost care as well as with prudent, balanced judgments. Malherbe is constrained, of course, to follow the rules of the series: new translation, notes

and comment for each pericope; no footnotes; the Greek given in transliteration. Malherbe, however, does not provide the usual special bibliography at the end of each pericope; there is only one extensive bibliography for the two letters together (17-52). But each letter has its own introduction (55-92 and 349-375).

What are the most striking characteristics of this new commentary? We mention five of them. Malherbe prefers and defends the opinion that 2 Thessalonians is written by Paul himself. Yet he qualifies the addressees. Since in Thessalonica there must have been more than one house church, the distinction between the primary and secondary audiences may help to explain the tension between the two letters: what constitutes the primary audience of 1 Thessalonians is only a secondary audience of 2 Thessalonians, and *vice versa*. So the immediate addressees of each letter are not completely the same. 'It was evidently Paul's custom to write one letter to all the groups when there were a number of groups ... It is therefore not incongruous at all that Paul wrote both letters to the entire church but focused on each of at least two groups as the initial recipient of a letter' (353; cf. 463 for the hypothesis that the original first letter 'had remained with the first recipients while a copy not bearing his signature was circulated among other Christians in the area').

Secondly, as could be expected especially for 1 Thessalonians, Malherbe offers a wealth of parallel texts mostly taken from more or less contemporary Greek philosophers who aim at a moral reformation in their society. The author, however, keeps stressing that conventional expressions have been radically adapted and modified by Paul, and turned to pastoral use. The numerous illustrations given by Malherbe are convincing, indeed. Elsewhere he writes: 'Paul uses the moral philosophical language of his day, but places it within a larger framework quite foreign to the philosophical tradition he uses' («Paul's Self-sufficiency (Philippians 4:11)», *Texts and Contexts. Biblical Texts in Their Textual and Situational Contexts* [FS. L. Hartman (eds. T. Fornberg – D. Hellholm) Oslo 1995] 823-824).

Thirdly, this commentary rejects a rhetorical approach for the structuring of the letters; see the brief negative judgment (96). 1 Thessalonians is a friendly, paraenetical, pastoral letter. The threefold thanksgiving which covers chapters 1-3 forms the basis for the explicit paraenesis of chapters 4-5 and is itself to some extent paraenetical. Malherbe refuses to consider 2,1-12 as an apologetical text. In this passage Paul presents himself as an example: the remembrance of his attitude and labor calls for imitation (2,14-16 is authentic). The author repeatedly uses the term 'psychagogy' to characterize Paul's mode of exhorting and admonishing (see esp. 323-324). 2 Thessalonians is written to console the discouraged, correct a false doctrine and warn the idlers and disorderly (375).

Fourthly, it certainly will strike the reader of this commentary that according to Malherbe no expectation of a near end is present in these two writings of Paul. More than once the 'restrained use' of apocalyptic material is underlined (e.g. 302, 400). In 1 Thess 4,12 and 5,1-11 Paul does not intend to motivate ethical behavior by means of a reference to the shortness of time. The problem which Paul faces in 1 Thess 4,13-18 is that some Christians are saddened by the thought that the deceased will come later at the parousia. Paul reassures them that those who are left until the coming will by no means

have precedence over those who have fallen asleep. The problem in 5,1-11 is created by Christian prophets who by preaching a deferral of the parousia proclaim a false security. In 2 Thess 2 Paul most probably has to deal with a misunderstanding of that text from 1 Thessalonians (429): some Christians maintain that the Day of the Lord has already come (2,2).

A fifth characteristic, which follows naturally from other positions taken by the author, concerns the reconstructions. Paul could have been working about three months in Thessalonica in the summer of 49 and must have announced the gospel in a quite detailed way. About four months after leaving the city, i.e. in the beginning of 50, he writes the first letter to the Thessalonians from Corinth. Then, six months later, the second letter is sent (as already mentioned, to a different primary audience in that city). It is possible, even probable, that on his return Timothy brought with him a letter from the Thessalonians to which 2 Thessalonians would then be an answer (see, e.g., 197, 208-210). One should here also mention Malherbe's fascinating reconstructions of what must have been the danger of discouragement of the isolated new converts in Thessalonica.

A first item of criticism is not meant so much for the author himself as for the series. Although the commentary is written in a polished, exemplary style, the text not always reads easily. Since in order to avoid footnotes the author has to put references to other authors, to grammar and biblical parallels, and also transliterated Greek words, within parentheses, the presentation often becomes heavy and less transparent. The reader's eye spontaneously looks for the closing parenthesis that may be found only two lines below. The train of thought is thus interrupted brusquely; at the end this can produce an irritating effect. A note: it is not always immediately evident to what or to which position the author refers with his use of 'so' (cf. 440 and 453).

It appears to me that Malherbe undervalues the eschatology of the Thessalonian correspondence, in particular Paul's expectation of the nearness of the parousia. In Malherbe's comment on 1 Thess 3,13 the awaiting of Christ's return is not even mentioned although the prayer speaks of 'the coming (*parousia*) of our Lord Jesus with all his saints'. That expectation, I think, is present everywhere in both letters. Even when in 2 Thess 2 'Paul' sets in sequence the eschatological events (lawlessness and apostasy, restraint, parousia of the man of lawlessness, parousia of Christ), the expectation, I think, is in no way suspended, rather heightened. It is true that in Thess 5,1-11 it is not the parousia of Christ but the coming of the Day of the Lord that is mentioned explicitly. One may ask: what is the difference? We can hardly assume that for Christian ethical life there is no eschatological motivation, only a reference to the Christian identity: because we are Christians, we must live as Christians. It would seem that the imminence spoken of in 5,3 also applies to Christians: because they are 'sons of day' the Day will not surprise them like a thief in the night (5,4-5). Paul most probably thought that the salvation through Christ and the Christians' living with him for ever (v. 10) were not far off.

Malherbe is of the opinion that in 49 Paul must already have written letters. So the argument that in 1 Thess 1-3 Paul has not yet his own stereotyped thanksgiving period (with actual thanking, remembering of the past and praying for the future) and that the threefold thanksgiving of 1

Thessalonians still shows 'the coming into existence', as it were, of Paul's way of introducing his letters, cannot meet his acceptance. Is this correct? Furthermore, is the refusal to detect any nuance of self-defense in 2,1-12 appropriate? And, in the division of these three chapters, should not more attention be given to the alternation of what is said of the Thessalonians and what Paul has done or is doing? Finally, can the function of these chapters be reduced to being a basis for the explicit paraenesis of chapters 4-5?

Other, admittedly minor, remarks can be made. For instance, it is not explained why in 1 Thess 1,3 the καί between 'God' and 'Father' is not translated. In the same verse one may doubt that the expressions 'the work of faith', 'the labor of love', and 'the endurance of hope' describe the strenuousness with which the Thessalonians 'preached the word' (108). Malherbe claims that in 3,3a 'these afflictions' refer to Paul's own experiences (192; cf. 196 and 198), but this seems rather unlikely (notwithstanding 3,7). One could list more such points with which one disagrees, at great risk, however, of forgetting the much greater number of those with which one agrees.

Omissions in the bibliography are the commentary of R. Pesch and, perhaps more to one's regret in connection with the possible non-Pauline authorship of 2 Thessalonians, R.F. Collins' *Letters That Paul Did Not Write* (GNSt 28; Wilmington 1988). The 'running titles' (134-164 and 165-177) are incorrect. Yet very few typographical errors have been detected (but see, e.g., 192, *hēmōn* instead of *humōn*, and 397 where, instead of *antapodounai*, the verb *paradidosthai* is written).

To what extent colleagues will be convinced by Malherbe's often personal approach cannot but remain uncertain, for example regarding the second letter's authenticity, but even more, it would seem, as to the distinction between the audiences. Yet everyone will admire the sound reasoning behind Malherbe's positions. The author provides us with a steadily close reading of the biblical text while his own text also demands a careful and close reading since each clause carries its weight. Without doubt, this well-informed, judicious commentary will soon be taken as a standard reference work. In conclusion, Malherbe's commentary is an outstanding piece of work, highly to be praised and recommended.

Waversebaan 220
B-3001 Heverlee

Jan LAMBRECHT, S.J.

Varia

Sönke VON STEMM, *Der betende Sünder vor Gott. Studien zu Vergebungsvorstellungen in urchristlichen und frühjüdischen Texten* (AGJU 45). Leiden, Brill, 2000. xv-388 p. 16 × 24,5. Dfl 242,41 – \$135

Estamos ante la publicación de la tesis doctoral defendida por el autor — Pastor de la Hannoversche Landeskirche en Hildesheim (Alemania) — en el verano de 1998 en la Humboldt Universität de Berlín, bajo la dirección de C. Breytenbach. El objetivo del trabajo es estudiar las representaciones del perdón divino que aparecen en textos del cristianismo primitivo y del judaísmo tardío. Para ello analiza una serie de pasajes presentes en esos textos, en los que aparece un orante suplicando perdón a Dios. En concreto, se seleccionan aquellos pasajes en los que se contienen expresiones de la acción de Dios que tiene como objeto la persona pecadora o el pecado mismo, y que no terminan con la destrucción o aniquilación del pecador. Se trata de oraciones, himnos o monólogos, presentes en obras generalmente narrativas, que tienen carácter ejemplar en su contexto. El autor señala desde el principio como en esas acciones, que se vienen entendiendo bajo el concepto genérico de “perdón”, se trasluce una diversidad de representaciones que viene confirmada por la misma diversidad de la terminología encontrada y por el análisis de cada uno de los pasajes como unidad textual en el interior de una obra.

Este planteamiento significa sin duda una novedad en el conjunto de la investigación reciente en torno al tema del perdón en el cristianismo primitivo y el judaísmo tardío. S. von Stemm quiere ir más allá de una visión de conjunto, como la presentada en los grandes Diccionarios teológicos del Nuevo Testamento al hilo de los términos en los que expresa el perdón (como hacía R. Bultmann en TWNT I, 506-509, o H. Vorländer en ThBNT II, 1263-1267), o la que aparece en los resultados de una investigación centrada en el Nuevo Testamento que, para entender el perdón, bien en perspectiva cristológica o eclesiológica (como p. ej. H. Thyen o H. Leroy) o bien en las palabras y actitudes del Jesús histórico frente a los pecadores (como P. Fiedler o C.-H. Sung), acuden de manera genérica a las representaciones judías de la época. Tampoco quiere limitarse a un estudio de la teología del judaísmo y de sus instituciones de perdón, incluso tomadas como base para una comparación con el cristianismo (J. Köberle, E. Sjöberg, E.P. Sanders o J.H. Charlesworth); ni seguir los pasos de una investigación de los más antiguos términos de perdón que aparecen en la literatura griega, incluidos los LXX y el NT (K. Metzler). El autor no rechaza la aportación de estas investigaciones de las que da debida cuenta, pero hace notar con razón que en ellas, por un lado, se utiliza el concepto de “perdón” de una forma genérica y, por otro, no se analizan con detenimiento los textos judíos apócrifos y pseudepigráficos escritos o transmitidos en griego. Por ello se plantea el estudio de esas unidades textuales detectables en el interior de una obra, en las que se expresa

con terminología diferenciada, la concepción que su autor tiene del actuar de Dios con el pecador. Se trata de un estudio sincrónico en el que se tiene en cuenta la función que dicha unidad juega en el conjunto de la obra a la que pertenece, y después se lleva a cabo un análisis estructural y semántico del texto de esa unidad.

Como textos judíos se seleccionan los siguientes: (a) El soliloquio y la oración de Asenet en José y Asenet 11–13, partiendo de la versión larga de esta obra. Ahí descubre tres nociones diversas de perdón que reflejan otros tantos modos de comprender la acción de Dios: En JosAs 11,1b-14 Dios actúa “no teniendo en cuenta”, “no castigando” las faltas, y haciendo así, en virtud de su misericordia y de la situación afligida de Asenet, una excepción a su modo de actuar descrito en Ex 34,6-7, pasaje al que se alude; en JosAs 11,16-18 la acción de Dios, en cambio, viene expresada como cese en su ira y reconciliación, al acoger la petición de Asenet (JosAs 11,18); en la oración de Asenet contenida en los caps. 12–13 la acción que se pide a Dios es que no considere culpables, atendiendo a las circunstancias, las acciones de Asenet. (b) La Oración de Manasés, en la que, aludiendo también a Ex 34,6-7 y a la misericordia de Dios, se pide a Dios que “se convierta” de su decisión de castigo por las faltas y no lo lleve a término (v. 13); Dios es también ahí quien da al pecador la oportunidad de convertirse de su mal actuar. (c) La oración de Tobit en el Libro de Tobías (Tb 3,2-6), de la que von Stemm resalta la relación entre la acción salvadora de Dios y la práctica, por parte del hombre, de las obras de misericordia y de justicia. La salvación del castigo de la enfermedad es posible por el comportamiento misericordioso del hombre; las buenas obras tienen ahí una función salvadora en la situación de desgracia reconocida al mismo tiempo justa por el pecado del pueblo. (d) Salmos de Salomón 9, donde entra en juego con fuerza la noción de la justicia de Dios que retribuye al hombre según su comportamiento, aunque el atributo divino que rige su actuar es fundamentalmente su misericordia, y ésta es la que mantiene la esperanza del pueblo. Dios castiga al hombre piadoso que reconoce su falta y no le trata como a los pecadores; sólo destruye a éstos. Ahí aparece el pensamiento de la Alianza del Dios de Israel con su pueblo. (e) Finalmente, la oración de Azarías en los añadidos griegos al Libro de Daniel (Dn 3,24-45), donde vuelve a aparecer con fuerza el pensamiento de la Alianza sobre el que se apoya la petición de que el castigo no llegue al final, y donde se presenta la oración como alternativa al sacrificio cultural: Dios la escucha de manera similar a cómo acepta el sacrificio, y ello implica el restablecimiento de la relación con Dios y su acción positiva hacia el hombre.

El autor selecciona tres textos cristianos que, según él, ejemplarizan las representaciones del perdón en el cristianismo primitivo. (a) La oración del publicano en el contexto de la parábola de Lc 18,9-14. En esta oración, que tiene como centro precisamente la autocomprensión de un pecador orante ante Dios (v. 13), no se precisa el deseo de una acción divina concreta, sino la inclinación bondadosa de Dios hacia el hombre. En esto consiste el perdón. (b) La oración que aparece al final de la Carta de Clemente de Roma a los Corintios (1 Clem 60,1b-3) y que, según von Stemm, es otro texto representativo. Ahí aparece una petición de perdón en el marco de la teología de la creación. Las faltas se comprenden como ruptura del orden que Dios ha impreso en la creación y en la sociedad. El perdón implica dos aspectos

fundamentales: la disculpa por parte de Dios del proceder pecador y la posibilidad de una nueva orientación del actuar del hombre para restablecer ese orden. Finalmente se analiza la quinta petición del Padrenuestro en la versión mateana (Mt 6,12). En ella ve von Stemm la correspondencia entre la acción del perdón de Dios y la acción del hombre. El pecado aparece con la connotación de deuda ante Dios, y el perdón consiste en la renuncia a las demandas derivadas de tal deuda. Con acierto hace notar el autor que el “como” de Mt 6,12 no tiene sentido condicional, sino comparativo o correlacional; y que la petición de perdón entra en el ámbito de lo de cada día, como la del pan en la petición anterior. En el contexto de la parénesis de Mateo, la petición de perdón forma parte de la conducta de los hijos de Dios en el seguimiento de Jesús y en las relaciones entre los miembros de la comunidad.

A partir de estos resultados, a los que se llega con el estudio detenido de las unidades textuales señaladas, von Stemm puede concluir que tanto en el ámbito del judaísmo tardío de habla griega, como en el cristianismo naciente, se dan diversas representaciones del perdón de Dios. Además, hace notar cómo, aunque se recoge la terminología de los LXX, especialmente de algunos salmos, aparecen expresiones y términos nuevos que proceden del lenguaje diario empleado en el griego koiné, y que vienen a hacer más explícita la naturaleza de las acciones de Dios que perdona. Al resumir, también a modo de conclusión, los aspectos de la fe en el perdón que tenía el cristianismo primitivo, vistos en el contexto de las representaciones del perdón en el judaísmo tardío, von Stemm señala algunos rasgos que predominan en el cristianismo o le son específicos: (a) El hecho de que, aunque en unos textos y otros se refleje igualmente la unión entre los hechos del hombre y sus consecuencias, en los textos cristianos la atención no se pone en los pecados concretos, sino en la conducta humana en su conjunto. La diferencia entre unos textos y otros no está en una comprensión diferente de lo que sea el pecado, sino que más bien se puede sospechar que tal diferencia se debe al contexto de la fe de sus autores: las oraciones cristianas están formuladas “desde la perspectiva de quien confiesa a Jesucristo y orienta su vida a Dios” (354). (b) El que, aunque en unos y otros textos se comprende el perdón relacionado con la vida y situación actual del orante, en los textos cristianos se acentúa que la acción de Dios que perdona es algo repetible; por eso se ha de pedir cada día.

En los textos estudiados aparecen además diversas “estructuras fijas” o presupuestos en los que se basan las representaciones del perdón. Tales son: (a) La Alianza de Dios con su pueblo en PsSal 9 y Dn 3. (b) La Misericordia de Dios en referencia a Ex 34,6-7, que se presupone en todos los textos, aunque entendida con acentos diferentes: en JosAs, como excepción al comportamiento divino descrito en Ex; en OrMan, como cambio de Dios en su actuación; en la parábola del publicano, como inclinación hacia el hombre. (c) La consideración de Dios como padre en JosAs y en el Padrenuestro, aunque con resonancias distintas. (d) La justicia de Dios creador, considerada en PsSal 9 y Tb 3 en relación al distinto comportamiento de los justos y misericordiosos, por un lado, y de los pecadores por otro, y en 1 Clem como soberanía del Dios creador que exige restaurar el orden roto por la desobediencia. (e) La ofrenda cultural que sólo en la oración de Azarías

aparece como referente para la representación del perdón — si bien su alternativa para encontrar misericordia es la oración —, mientras que esa referencia está ausente en los textos cristianos. Finalmente, queda señalada la oración como el fundamento para la representación del perdón al que apelan la mayoría de los textos. Común a todas las concepciones de perdón investigadas es el hecho de que la fe en el perdón se fundamenta en el restablecimiento de la relación con Dios, y la expresión más evidente de esa relación es la oración. Por eso, el orante aparece como pecador delante de Dios.

Esta obra representa sin duda alguna una aportación notable al conocimiento de las representaciones del perdón de Dios sobre todo en el judaísmo tardío de habla griega, en cuyo contexto se desarrolla el cristianismo y vieron la luz los primeros escritos cristianos. El estudio de los textos relacionados con el perdón y representativos de ese judaísmo no se había realizado de manera directa y como tema monográfico tal como lo hace von Stemm. Los cinco textos oracionales seleccionados son ciertamente representativos del judaísmo helenístico. El método de análisis empleado, estudio de unidades textuales diferenciadas en el interior de una obra a la luz de la obra en su conjunto, representa la forma más objetiva de poner en evidencia la representación del perdón que ahí se contiene. Es así como se concluye, con acierto, la variedad de tales representaciones que suponen distintas formas de actuar de Dios, y que enriquecen teológicamente el concepto de “perdón”. Algo parecido hay que decir respecto a los textos cristianos seleccionados; pero es en este ámbito en el que, a mi juicio, el estudio de von Stemm queda incompleto. Si se trata de unidades textuales oracionales, detectables como tales en el interior de una obra, ¿no lo son también con referencia directa al perdón de los pecados el “Cántico de Zacarías” en Lc 1,68-79 y el himno de Ef 1,13-14? El estudio de esas dos unidades, así como el de algunos discursos de Hechos de los Apóstoles — que también son diferenciables como unidades textuales dentro de la obra y hacen referencia al perdón (cf. p. ej. He 2,38; 3,19; 13,38) —, hubiese dado una visión más completa de las representaciones del perdón en el cristianismo primitivo. Pero sin duda lo que el autor ha buscado en su planteamiento ha sido primordialmente presentar la conciencia del hombre que se siente pecador delante de Dios, tal como se expresa en el judaísmo helenístico y en algunos textos del cristianismo primitivo. En este sentido, el contenido del libro corresponde al título que se le ha dado.

Las pequeñas erratas que puedan encontrarse — “spechenden” por “sprechenden” (49), “tocher” por “tochter” (54), “a” por “d”) (119), “1.” por “2.” (120) — no merman la buena presentación tipográfica y editorial a las que nos tiene acostumbrados Brill, que acrecienta la colección de “Arbeiten zur Geschichte des antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums” con una obra cuya publicación merecía verdaderamente la pena.

NUNTII PERSONARUM ET RERUM

Pontificium Institutum Biblicum Annus academicus 2001-2002. I semestre

Auditores inscripti erant 342, qui in diversas categorias sic distribuebantur:

	Ad Doctoratum	Ad Licentiam	Hospites	Universi
Fac. Biblica	15	299	12	326
Fac. Orientalistica	—	3	13	16
Universi	15	302	25	342
Nationes	67	Alumni	342	
Dioceses	169	Alumni	180	
Inst. Religiosorum	52	Alumni	121	
Inst. Religiosarum	10	Alumnae	10	
Ex statu laicali	31	Alumnae	18	
		Alumni	13	

Laureae

Laureae in Re Biblica dignus declaratus est:

KARUMATHY, Gervasis (06.11.2001), "*Out of My Distress, o YHWH!*". *Outcry in the Hebrew Bible* (cum laude). Moderator: S. Pisano.

Doctor in Re Biblica renuntiatus est, typis edita thesi:

MALINA, Artur, «*Non come gli scribi*» (*Mc 1,22*). *Studio del loro ruolo nel Vangelo di Marco*. Roma 2001 (extractum).

LIBRI AD DIRECTIONEM MISSI

La liste ci-dessous comprend tous les livres adressés à Biblica qui sont en rapport avec les études bibliques, y compris ceux qui ne pourront faire l'objet d'un compte rendu. En signalant un ouvrage, la Revue ne se prononce pas à son sujet.

Les livres envoyés à la Revue ne seront pas retournés à l'expéditeur, même si aucun compte rendu n'en est publié (à moins qu'ils n'aient été envoyés sur demande de la Direction).

Les livres et les articles ou extraits de revues qui nous sont adressés seront communiqués au directeur de l'Elenchus of Biblical Bibliography.

Prière d'adresser les envois à la «Direction de Biblica, Pontificio Istituto Biblico, Via della Pilotta, 25, I-00187 Rome, Italie».

AA. VV., *El Text: Lectures i Història* (Scripta Biblica 3). Montserrat, Associació Bíblica de Catalunya, Publicacions de l'Abadia de Montserrat, 2001. 373 p. 15,5 × 23

Achtemeier, Paul J. – **Green**, Joel B. – **Thompson**, Marianne Meye, *Introducing the New Testament. Its Literature and Theology*. Grand Rapids, William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2001. xii-624 p. 19 × 24. \$35.00 – £24.99

Andersen, Francis I., *Habakkuk. A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 25). New York, Doubleday, 2001. xxii-387 p. 16 × 24. \$45.00 – Can \$65.95

Backhaus, Knut (Hrsg.), *Theologie als Vision*. Studien zur Johannes-Offenbarung (SBS 191). Stuttgart, Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk, 2001. 207 p. 13,5 × 21. DM 47,80

Bahrani, Zainab, *Women of Babylon*. Gender and Representation in Mesopotamia. London, Routledge, 2001. xii-212 p. 16 × 24. £45.00

Bar, Shaul, *A Letter That Has Not Been Read*. Dreams in the Hebrew Bible. Translated by Lenn J. Schramm. Cincinnati, Hebrew Union College Press, 2001. xii-257 p. 16 × 24,50. \$39.9

Basal, Nasir, *Kitâb Al-Nutaf by Judah Hayyûj*. A Critical Edition (Texts and Studies in the Hebrew Language and Related Subjects 11). Tel Aviv, Tel Aviv University, 2001. xiv-343 p. 17,5 × 24,5

Baumert, Norbert, *Studien zu den Paulusbriefen* (Stuttgarter Biblische Aufsatzbände Neues Testament 32). Stuttgart, Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk GmbH, 2001. 320 p. 14,5 × 21,5. €40,39 – DM 79 – ÖS 577 – SFr 75

Benzi, Guido, *Paolo e il suo Vangelo* (Interpretare la Bibbia oggi 2.5). Brescia, Editrice Queriniana, 2001. 170 p. 13,5 × 21. €12,39 – Lit. 24.000

La Bible d'Alexandrie. Le Pentateuque. Texte grec et traduction. Ouvrage collectif sous la direction de Cécile **Dogniez** et Marguerite **Harl**. Paris, Les Éditions du Cerf, 2001. 922 p. 16 × 23. €38 – FF 249,26

Biblia Hebraica Leningradensia. Prepared according to the Vocalization, Accents, and Masora of Aaron ben Moses ben Asher in the Leningrad Codex. Edited by Aron **Dotan**. Peabody, Hendrickson Publishers, 2001. xxv-1264 p. 16 × 21. \$49.95

Bieringer, R. – Pollefeyt, D. – Vandecasteele-Vanneuville, F. (eds.), *Anti-Judaism and the Fourth Gospel*. Papers of the Leuven Colloquium, 2000. (Jewish and Christian Heritage Series 1). Assen, Royal Van Gorcum, 2001. xvi-612 p. 16 × 24,5. Dfl 230 – \$97,50

Black, C. Clifton, *Mark*. Images of an Apostolic Interpreter (Studies on Personalities of the New Testament). Minneapolis, Fortress Press, 2001. xx-327 p. 15 × 23. \$20.00

Boer, Roland, *Last Stop Before Antarctica*. The Bible and Postcolonial Australia (The Bible and Postcolonialism 6). Sheffield, Academic Press, 2001. 219 p. 15,5 × 23,5. £14.95 – \$21.95

Braulik, Georg, *Studien zum Deuteronomium und seiner Nachgeschichte* (Stuttgarter biblischer Aufsatzbände 33). Stuttgart, Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk GmbH, 2001. 303 p. 14,5 × 20,5. DM 79,—

Brooke, George J. (ed.), *Society for Old Testament Study Book List 2001*. Sheffield, Academic Press, 2001. vi-190 p. 15,5 × 23,5. £14.95 – \$24.50

Buzzetti, Carlo, *Tradizioni e traduzioni*. La via dell'uso-confronto (Studi religiosi). Padova, Edizioni Messaggero, 2001. 254 p. 14 × 21. €16,50 – Lit. 31,948

Calduch-Benages, Nuria (ed.), *La Sagrada Familia en la Biblia* (Biblioteca Manual Desclée 28). Bilbao, Desclée De Brouwer, 2001. 221 p. 15,5 × 23,5

Calduch-Benages, Nuria, *Un gioiello di sapienza*. Leggendo Siracide 2 (Cammini nello Spirito Biblica 45). Milano, Paoline, 2001. 178 p. 13,5 × 21

Cardellini, Innocenzo, *I sacrifici dell'antica alleanza*. Tipologie, Rituali, Celebrazioni (Studi sulla Bibbia e il suo ambiente 5). Cinisello Balsamo, San Paolo, 2001. 574 p. 14,5 × 21,5. €29,95 – Lit. 58.000

Carter, Warren, *Matthew and the Margins*. A Socio-Political and Religious Reading (JSNTSS 204). Sheffield, Academic Press, 2001. xx-636 p. 16 × 24. £60.00 – \$95.00

Casalini, Nello, *Iniziazione al Nuovo Testamento* (Studium Biblicum Franciscanum Analecta 53). Jerusalem, Franciscan Printing Press, 2001. 396 p. 17 × 24. \$25.00

Casalini, Nello, *Le lettere di Paolo*. Esposizione del loro sistema di teologia (Studium Biblicum Franciscanum Analecta 54). Jerusalem, Franciscan Printing Press, 2001. 304 p. 17 × 24. \$20.00

Cassidy, Richard J., *Paul in Chains*. Roman Imprisonment and the Letters of St. Paul. New York, A Herder and Herder Book – The Crossroad Publishing Company, 2001. xv-317 p. 15 × 22,5. \$24.95

Chapman, Mark D., *The Coming Crisis*. The Impact of Eschatology on Theology in Edwardian England (JSNTSS 208). Sheffield, Academic Press, 2001. 186 p. 16 × 24. £40.00 – \$64.00

Cilumba Cimbumba Ndayango, Antoine, *Wunder, Glaube und Leben bei Johannes*. Eine exegetisch-hermeneutische Studie am Beispiel von Joh 3 im Hinblick auf die Interkulturationsaufgabe (Arbeiten zur Interkulturalität 3). Bonn, Borengässer, 2001. x-331 p. 15,5 × 22. €27,60 – DM 54 – SFr 49 – ÖS 402

Cohen, Menahem (ed.), *Mikra'ot Gedolot "HaKeter"*. A revised and augmented scientific edition of 'Mikra'ot Gedolot'. Based on the Aleppo Codex and early Medieval MSS. Ramat Gan, Bar-Ilan University Press, 2000. xiv-339 p. 23,5 × 30,5

Cohen, Richard A., *Ethics, Exegesis and Philosophy*. Interpretation after Levinas. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2001. vii-361 p. 14,5 × 22. £45.00 – \$64.95

Cohn-Sherbok, Dan – **Court**, John M. (eds.), *Religious Diversity in the Graeco-Roman World*. A Survey of Recent Scholarship (The Biblical Seminar 79). Sheffield, Academic Press, 2001. 237 p. 15,5 × 23,5. £14.97 – \$19.95

Collins, John J. – **Flint**, Peter W. (eds.), *The Book of Daniel*. Composition & Reception (VTS 83,1-2). Leiden – Boston – Köln, Brill, 2001. Vol. 1: xx-290 p. Vol. 2: xxii-291-769 p. 16,5 × 24,5. Dfl 160,87 – \$95.00 (Vol. 1); Dfl 251,22 – \$133.00 (Vol. 2)

Corsani, Bruno, *Lutero e la Bibbia* (Interpretare la Bibbia oggi 3.10). Brescia, Editrice Queriniana 2001. 118 p. 13,5 × 21. €8,78 – Lit. 17.000

Cremascoli, Giuseppe, *L'esegesi biblica di Gregorio Magno* (Interpretare la Bibbia oggi 3.6). Brescia, Editrice Queriniana, 2001. 166 p. 13,5 × 21. €11,88 – Lit. 23.000

Dancy, John, *The Divine Drama*. The Old Testament as Literature. Cambridge, The Lutterworth Press, 2001. 800 p. 16 × 23. £17.50

Danove, Paul, *Linguistics and Exegesis in the Gospel of Mark*. Applications of a Case Frame Analysis (JSNTSS 218; Studies in New Testament Greek 10). Sheffield, Academic Press, 2001. 247 p. 14 × 26. £50.00 – \$85.00

Daviau, P. M. Michèle – **Wevers**, John W. – **Weigl**, Michael (eds.), *The World of the Aramaeans I*. Biblical Studies in Honour of Paul-Eugène Dion (JSOTSS 324). Sheffield, Academic Press, 2001. 323 p. 16 × 24. £53.50 – \$84.00

Daviau, P. M. Michèle – **Wevers**, John W. – **Weigl**, Michael (eds.), *The World of the Aramaeans II*. Studies in History and Archaeology in Honour of Paul-Eugène Dion (JSOTSS 325). Sheffield, Academic Press, 2001. 329 p. 16 × 24. £53.50 – \$84.00

Daviau, P. M. Michèle, – **Wevers**, John W. – **Weigl**, Michael (eds.), *The World of the Aramaeans III*. Studies in Language and Literature in Honour of Paul-Eugène Dion (JSOTSS 326). Sheffield, Academic Press, 2001. 311 p. 16 × 24. £53.50 – \$84.00

Davila, James R., *Liturgical Works* (Eerdmans Commentary on the Dead Sea Scrolls 6). Grand Rapids, Michigan – Cambridge, U. K., William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2000. xi-338 p. 16 × 23,5. \$25.00 – £17.99

Delobel, Joël et al. (eds.) *Vroegchristelijke gemeenten tussen werkelijkheid en Ideaal*. Opstellen van leden van de Studiosorum Novi Testamenti Conventus. Kampen, Kok, 2001. 223 p. 16 × 24

Dik, J. W. et al. (eds.), *Unless some one guide me ...* Festschrift for Karel A. Deurloo (Amsterdamse Cahiers voor Exegese van de Bijbel en zijn Tradities: Supplement Series, 2). Maastricht, Uitgeverij Shaker Publishing, 2001. xv-422 p. 17 × 24

DiTommaso, Lorenzo, *A Bibliography of Pseudepigrapha Research 1850-1999* (Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha Supplement Series 39). Sheffield, Academic Press, 2001. 1067 p. 16 × 24. £90.00 – \$130.00

Dube, Musa W. (ed.), *Other Ways of Reading*. African Women and the Bible (Global Perspectives on Biblical Scholarship 2). Atlanta, Society of Biblical Literature – Geneva, WCC, 2001. xiii-254 p. 15 × 23. \$24.95

Duggan, Michael W., *The Covenant Renewal in Ezra-Nehemiah (Neh. 7:72b-10:40)*. An Exegetical, Literary, and Theological Study (SBLDS 164). Atlanta, Society of Biblical Literature, 2001. xii-372 p. 15 × 22,5. \$49.95

Estrada, Bernardo, «*Lieti nella speranza*». La gioia nel Nuovo Testamento (Studi di teologia 8). Roma, Edizioni Università della Santa Croce, 2001. 328 p. 16 × 24. €24,79 – Lit. 48.000

Favaro, Gaetano, *Lectures della Bibbia nel contesto religioso e socioculturale dell'India contemporanea* (Interpretare la Bibbia oggi 5.3). Brescia, Editrice Queriniana, 2001. 188 p. 13,5 × 21. €12,91 – Lit. 25.000

Ferrario, Fulvio, *I dieci comandamenti* (Cinquantapagine 25). Torino, Claudiana, 2001. 63 p. 12 × 16 p. €3,00 – Lit. 5.800

Fieger, Michael – **Schmid**, Konrad – **Schwagmeir**, Peter (Hrsg.), *Qumran – Die Schriftrollen vom Toten Meer*. Vorträge des St. Galler Qumran-Symposiums vom 2./3. Juli 1999 (Novum Testamentum et Orbis Antiquus 47). Freiburg Schweiz, Universitätsverlag – Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2001. viii-226 p. 16 × 23,5. SFr 68,—

Filorama, Giovanni – **Gianotto**, Claudio (a cura di), *Verus Israel*. Nuove prospettive sul giudeocristianesimo. Atti del colloquio di Torino (4-5 novembre 1999) (Biblioteca di cultura religiosa 65). Brescia, Paideia Editrice, 2001. 15 × 21 388 p. Lit. 58.000

Fisk, Bruce Norman, *Do you Not Remember?* Scripture, Story and Exegesis in the Rewritten Bible of Pseudo-Philo (Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha 37). Sheffield, Academic Press, 2001. 375 p. 16 × 24. £50.00 – \$80.00

Fuchs, Andreas – **Parpola**, Simo (eds.), *The Correspondence of Sargon II, Part III: Letters from Babylonia and the Eastern Provinces* (State Archives of Assyria, 15). Helsinki, Helsinki University Press, 2001. lviii-281 p. 17,5 × 25

Fusco, Vittorio, *Les Premières Communautés chrétiennes*. Traditions et tendances dans le christianisme des origines (LD 188). Paris, Les Éditions du Cerf, 2001. 375 p. 13,5 × 21,5. FF 250

Galil, Gershon – **Weinfeld**, Moshe (eds.), *Studies in Historical Geography & Biblical Historiography*. Presented to Zecharia Kallai (VTS 81). Leiden – Boston – Köln, Brill, 2000. xii-281 p. 16,5 × 24,5. Dfl 189,52 – \$100.00

García-Moreno, Antonio, *Jesús el Nazareno, el Rey de los judíos*. Estudios de cristología joánica (Colección teológica 103). Pamplona, Ediciones Universidad de Navarra, 2001. 455 p. 16 × 24,5

Gerdmar, Anders, *Rethinking the Judaism-Hellenism Dichotomy*. A Historiographical Case Study of Second Peter and Jude (ConB New Testament Series 36). Stockholm, Almqvist & Wiksell International, 2001. 378 p. 16,5 × 24. SEK 294,00

Gerstenberger, Erhard S., *Psalms, Part 2, and Lamentations* (The Forms of the Old Testament Literature 15). Grand Rapids – Cambridge, William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2001. xxii-543 p. 15,5 × 23. \$45.00 – £30.00

Goldman, Yohanan – Uehlinger, Christoph (eds.), *La double transmission du texte biblique*. Études d'histoire du texte offertes en hommage à Adrian Schenker (OBO 179). Fribourg (Suisse), Editions Universitaires – Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2001. 114 p. 15,5 × 23,5. €25 – SFr 38 – DM 46 – ÖS 336 –

Gorman, Michael J., *Cruciformity*. Paul's Narrative Spirituality of the Cross. Grand Rapids – Cambridge, William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2001. xi-429 p. 16 × 23,5. \$28.00 – £19.99

Grabbe, Lester L. – Haak, Robert D. (eds.), *'Every City shall be Forsaken'*. Urbanism and Prophecy in Ancient Israel and the Near East (JSOTSS 330). Sheffield, Academic Press, 2001. 226 p. 16 × 24. £46.00 – \$73.00

Graffy, Adrian, *Trustworthy and True*. The Gospels beyond 2001. Blackrock Co. Dublin, The Columba Press, 2001. 258 p. 13,5 × 21,5. IR£9.99 – £7.99

Habel, Norman (ed.), *The Earth Story in the Psalms and the Prophets* (The Earth Bible 4). Sheffield, Academic Press – Cleveland, The Pilgrim Press, 2001. 261 p. 13,5 × 23,5. £17.99 – \$29.95

Habel, Norman C. – Wurst, Shirley (eds.), *The Earth Story in Wisdom Traditions* (The Earth Bible 3). Sheffield, The Academic Press – Cleveland, The Pilgrim Press, 2001. 213 p. 15,5 × 23,5. £17.99 – \$29.95

Halpern, Baruch, *David's Secret Demons*. Messiah, Murderer, Traitor, King. (The Bible in its World). Grand Rapids – Cambridge, William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2001. xx-492 p. 16,5 × 24. \$30.00 – £19.99

Harding, Mark, *What Are They Saying about the Pastoral Epistles?* New York – Mahwah, Paulist Press, 2001. ix-146 p. 13,5 × 20. \$13.95

Harrington, Jay M., *The Lukan Passion Narrative: The Markan Material in Luke 22,54–23,25*. A Historical Survey 1891-1997 (NTTS 30). Leiden, Brill, 2000. xiii-1003 p. 16 × 24,5

Hartmann, Der Tod Johannes' des Täufers. Eine exegetische und rezeptionsgeschichtliche Studie auf dem Hintergrund narrativer, intertextueller und kulturanthropologischer Zugänge (SBB 45). Stuttgart, Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk, 2001. 399 p. 14,5 × 21,5. €45,50 – DM 89 – ÖS 650 – SFr 85

Hauge, Martin Ravndal, *The Descent from the Mountain*. Narrative Patterns in Exodus 19-40 (JSOTSS 323). Sheffield, Academic Press, 2001. 362 p. 16 × 24. £56.00 – \$88.00

Heard, R. Christopher, *Dynamics of Diselection*. Ambiguity of Genesis 12-36 and Ethnic Boundaries in Post-Exilic Judah (Society of Biblical Literature Semeia Studies 39). Atlanta, Society of Biblical Literature, 2001. xii-212 p. 15 × 23. \$29.95

Heil, Johannes – Kampling, Rainer (Hrsg.), *Maria – Tochter Zion?* Mariologie, Marienfrömmigkeit und Judenfeindschaft. Paderborn, Ferdinand Schöningh, 2001. 271 p. 15,5 × 23,5. DM 78,00

Hellerman, Joseph H., *The Ancient Church as Family*. Minneapolis, Fortress Press, 2001. xv-295 p. 15,5 × 23. \$23.00

Hengel, Martin, *Giudaismo ed ellenismo*. Studi sul loro incontro, con particolare riguardo per la Palestina fino alla metà del II secolo a.C. (Biblioteca di storia e storiografia dei tempi biblici 14). Brescia, Paideia Editrice, 2001. 763 p. 15,5 × 23. Lit. 142.000

Hiebert, J. V. – Cox, Claude – Gentry, Peter J. (eds.), *The Old Greek Psalter*. Studies in Honour of Albert Pietersma (JSOTSS 332). Sheffield, Academic Press, 2001. 346 p. 16 × 24. £53.50 – \$84.00

Hill, Charles E., *Regnum Caelorum*. Patterns of Millennial Thought in Early Christianity. Second Edition. Grand Rapids, Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2001. xx-324 p. 16 × 23,5. \$30.00 – £19.99

Horsley, Richard A., *Hearing the Whole Story*. The Politics of Plot in Mark's Gospel. Louisville – London – Leiden, Westminster John Knox Press, 2001. xv-296 p. 15 × 23. £20.00

Humphreys, W. Lee, *The Character of God in the Book of Genesis*. A Narrative Appraisal. Louisville – London – Leiden, Westminster John Knox Press, 2001. x-284 p. 15 × 23. £20.00

Hutchinson Edgar, David, *Has God not Chosen the Poor?* The Social Setting of the Epistle of James (JSNTSS 206). Sheffield, Academic Press, 2001. 261 p. 16 × 24. £40.00 – \$64.00

Isherwood, Lisa – McEwan, Dorothea, *Introducing Feminist Theology*. Second Edition. Sheffield, Academic Press, 2001. 167 p. 15,5 × 23,5. £12.95 – \$18.95

Isserlin, B. S. J., *The Israelites*. Minneapolis, Fortress Press, 2001. 304 p. 17 × 25. \$23.00

Izre'el, Shlomo, *Adapa and the South Wind*. Language Has the Power of Life and Death (Mesopotamian Civilizations 10). Winona Lake, Eisenbrauns, 2001. xii-183p. 18,5 × 26. \$36.50

Jacobs, Mignon R., *The Conceptual Coherence of the Book of Micah* (JSOTSS 322). Sheffield, Academic Press, 2001. 283 p. 16 × 24. £50.00 – \$80.00

Jasnos, Renata, *Teologia prawa w Deuteronomium* (Studia pedagogiczne). Kraków, Wyższa Szkoła Filozoficzno-Pedagogiczna IGNATIANUM, 2001. 300 p. 15,5 × 23

Jossa, Giorgio, *I gruppi giudaici ai tempi di Gesù* (Biblioteca di cultura religiosa 66). Brescia, Paideia Editrice, 2001. 222 p. 15 × 21. Lit. 36.00

Keel, Othmar – Uehlinger, Christoph, *Dieux, déesses et figures divines*. Les sources iconographiques de l'histoire de la religion d'Israël. Paris, Les Éditions du Cerf, 2001. 489 p. 18 × 23. FF 350

Koester, Craig R., *Hebrews*. A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary (AB 36). New York, Doubleday, 2001. xxiii-604 p. 16 × 24. \$47.50 – Can\$70.00

Konkel, Michael, *Architektonik des Heiligen*. Studien zur zweiten Tempelvision Ezechiels (Ez 40-48) (BBB 129). Berlin – Wien, Philo, 2001. xvi-398 p. 17,5 × 24,5. DM 118,00

Kugler, Robert A., *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* (Guides to the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha 10). Sheffield, Academic Press, 2001. 122 p. 14 × 21,5. £8.95 – \$14.95

Labahn, Michael – Schmidt, Andreas (eds.), *Jesus, Mark and Q*. The Teaching of Jesus and its Earliest Records (JSNTSS 214). Sheffield, Academic Press, 2001. 296 p. 16 × 24. £40.00 – \$84.00

Lambrecht, Jan, *Collected Studies on Pauline Literature and on the Book of Revelation* (AnBib 147). Roma, Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 2001. xv-435 p. 16,5 × 24. €25,82 – Lit. 50.00 – \$27.00

LaRocca-Pitts, Elizabeth C., *"Of Wood and Stone"*. The Significance of Israelite Cultic Items in the Bible and its Early Interpreters (HSM 61). Winona Lake, Eisenbrauns, 2001. xiii-385 p. 15,5 × 23,5. \$39.95

Lattke, Michael, *Oden Salomos*. Text, Übersetzung, Kommentar. Teil 2: Oden 15-28 (Novum Testamentum et Orbis Antiquus 41/2). Freiburg (Schweiz) Universitätsverlag – Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2001. xi-330 p. 16 × 23,5. SFr 98,—

Lavatori, Renzo – **Sole**, Luciano, *Ritratti dal Vangelo di Luca*. Persone e relazioni (Bibbia e spiritualità 14). Bologna, Edizioni Dehoniane 2001. 295 p. 14 × 21. €19,11 – Lit. 37.000

Lemaire, A. – **Sæbø**, M. (eds.), *Congress Volume Oslo 1998* (VTS 80). Leiden – Boston – Köln, Brill, 2000. xii-507 p. 16,5 × 24,5. Dfl 297,50 – \$157

Levine, Amy-Jill, *A Feminist Companion to Mark*. With Marianne Bickenstaff (Feminist Companion to the New Testament and Early Christian Writings 2). Sheffield, Academic Press, 2001. 261 p. 15,5 × 23,5. £17.99 – \$29.95

Levine, Amy-Jill, *A Feminist Companion to Matthew*. With Marianne Bickenstaff (Feminist Companion to the New Testament and Early Christian Writings 1). Sheffield, Academic Press, 2001. 247 p. 15,5 × 23,5. £17.99 – £29.95

Lim, Timothy H. – **MacQueen**, Hector L. – **Carmichael**, Calum M. (eds.), *On Scrolls, Artefacts and Intellectual Property* (Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha 38). Sheffield, Academic Press, 2001. 269 p. 16 × 24. £50.00 – \$80.00

Lingad, Celestino G., *The Problems of Jewish Christians in the Johannine Community* (Tesi Gregoriana Serie Teologia 73). Roma, Editrice Pontificia Università Gregoriana, 2001. 487 p. 17 × 24. €25,82 – Lit. 50.00 – \$27.00

Loader, William, *Jesus and the Fundamentalism of His Day*. Grand Rapids, MI – Cambridge, U. K., William B. Eerdmans, 2001. vi-156 p. 15 × 23. \$14.00 – £9.99

Lukian, ΦΙΛΟΨΕΥΔΕΙΣ Η ΑΠΙΣΤΟΝ. Die Lügenfreunde oder: die Ungläubige. Eingeleitet, übersetzt und mit interpretierenden Essays versehen von Martin Ebner u. a. (SAPERE 3). Darmstadt, Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 2001. 214 p. 14 × 21,5. DM 49,90 – SFr 46,20 – ÖS 364,—

Masalles, Victor, *La profecía en la asamblea cristiana*. Análisis retórico-literario de 1 Cor. 14,1-25 (Tesi Gregoriana Serie Teologia 74). Roma, Editrice Pontificia Università Gregoriana, 2001. 410 p. 17 × 24. €23,24 – Lit. 45.000 – \$24.00

Matson, Mark A., *In Dialogue with Another Gospel? The Influence of the Fourth Gospel on the Passion Narrative of the Gospel of Luke* (SBLDS 178). Atlanta, Society of Biblical Literature, 2001. xiii-479 p. 14,5 × 22. \$54.00

Mazar, Amihai (ed.), *Studies in the Archaeology of the Iron Age in Israel and Jordan* (JSOTSS 331). Sheffield, Academic Press, 2001. 337 p. 16 × 24. £56.00 – \$85.00

McGrath, James F., *John's Apologetic Christology*. Legitimation and Development in Johannine Christology (SNTSMS 111). Cambridge, University Press, 2001. xii-269 p. 14,5 × 22.

Meier, John P., *A Marginal Jew. Rethinking the Historical Jesus. Volume Three: Companions and Competitors*. New York, Doubleday, 2001. xiv-703 p. 16,5 × 24. \$42.50 – Can \$63.50

Mendenhall, George E., *Ancient Israel's Faith and History*. An Introduction to the Bible in Context. Edited by Gary A. Herion. Louisville – London – Leiden, Westminster John Knox Press, 2001. xx-284 p. 19 × 23,5. £20.00

Michel, Cécile, *Correspondance des marchands de Kaniš au début du IIe millénaire avant J.-C.* (Littératures anciennes du Proche-Orient 19). Paris, Les Éditions du Cerf, 2001. 601 p. 12,5 × 19,5. FF 240

Die Midraschim zu Ester (Rabbinische Kommentar zum Buch Ester 2). Übersetzt von Dagmar **Bören-Klein** und Elisabeth **Hollender**. Leiden, Brill, 2000. 526 p. 16 × 24,5. € 100 – \$123 – Dfl 220.37

Milgrom, Jacob, *Leviticus 23-27*. A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary (AB 3B). New York, Doubleday, 2001. xxi,-pp.1895-2714. 16 × 24. \$50.00 – Can\$75.00

Molinaro, Italo, *Ha parlato nel Figlio*. Progettualità di Dio e risposta di Cristo nella lettera agli Ebrei (Studium Biblicum Franciscanum Analecta 55). Jerusalem Franciscan Printing Press, 2001. 360 p. 17 × 24. \$20.00

Mora, Vincent, O.S.B., *La Symbolique de Matthieu*. II Les groupes (LD 187). Paris, Les Éditions du Cerf, 2001. 394 p. 13,5 × 21,5. FF 240

Niccacci, Alviero (ed.), *Jerusalem*. House of Prayer for all Nations (Studium Biblicum Franciscanum Analecta 52). Jerusalem, Franciscan Printing Press, 2001. 193 p. 17 × 24. \$15.00

North, Robert, S. J., *Bibliography: 1936-2002* (Subsidia biblica 21). Roma, Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 2001. 126 p. 16,5 × 24. € 12,91 – Lit. 25.000 – \$14.00

Orge, Manuel, *¿Es posible la virginidad?* Criterios paulinos para su discernimiento (Monografías 9). Madrid, Publicaciones Claretianas, 2001. 223 p. 16 × 22

Origène, *Homélies sur les Nombres*. Tome III: *Homélies XX-XXVIII*. Nouvelle édition par Louis Doutreleau (SC 461). Paris, Éditions du Cerf, 2001. 396 p. 13 × 19,5. FF 256

Pardo Izal, José Javier, *Pasión por un futuro imposible*. Estudio literario-teológico de Jeremías 32 (Tesi Gregoriana Serie Teología 76). Roma, Editrice Pontificia Università Gregoriana, 2001. 406 p. 17 × 24. € 23,24 – Lit. 45.000 – \$24.00

Pentiuc, Eugen J., *West Semitic Vocabulary in the Accadian Texts from Emar* (HSS 49). Winona Lake, Eisenbrauns, 2001. xvii-278 p. 15,5 × 23,5. \$36.95

Pulikottil, Paulson, *Transmission of Biblical Texts in Qumran*. The Case of the Large Isaiah Scroll 1 QIsa^a (Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha 34). Sheffield, Academic Press, 2001. 240 p. 16 × 24. £50.00 – \$80.00

Reiser, Marius, *Sprache und literarische Formen des Neuen Testaments* (UTB für Wissenschaft 2197). Paderborn, Ferdinand Schöningh, 2001. xiv-257 p. 12 × 18,5. DM 26,80

Rendtorff, Rolf, *La «formula dell'alleanza»*. Ricerca esegetica e teologica (Studi biblici 128). Brescia, Paideia Editrice, 2001. 158 p. 13,5 × 21. Lit. 26.000

Rendtorff, Rolf, *Teologia dell'Antico Testamento*. Volume Primo: Sviluppo canonico (Strumenti 5: Biblica). Torino, Claudiana Editrice, 2001. 478 p. 17 × 24. €29,95 – Lit. 58.000

Riches, John – **Telford**, William R. – **Tuckett**, Christopher M., *The Synoptic Gospels*. With an Introduction by Scot McKnight. Sheffield, Academic Press, 2001. 359 p. 15,5 × 23. £16.95 – \$24.95

Rogerson, John W. – **Moberly**, R. W. L. – **Johnstone**, William, *Genesis and Exodus*. With an Introduction by John Goldingay (Biblical Guides). Sheffield, Academic Press, 2001. 289 p. 15,5 × 23. £16.95 – \$24.95

Rolin, Patrice, *Les controverses dans l'évangile de Marc* (EB 43). Paris, J. Gabalda et C^{ie}, 2001. 383 p. 16 × 24. €45,74 – FF 300

Romaniello, Giuseppe, *Interpretazione autentica del «Pater Noster» e «i limiti del potere di Satana»*. Latina, Editor «Phos», 2001. 319 p. 17 × 24. €15,493 – Lit. 30.000

Rudman, Dominic, *Determinism in the Book of Ecclesiastes* (JSOTSS 316). Sheffield, Academic Press, 2001. 226 p. 16 × 24. £40.00 – \$64.00

Sacchi, Alessandro, *Fede di Israele e messaggio cristiano*. Alle radici del cristianesimo (Interpretare la Bibbia oggi 2.7). Brescia, Editrice Queriniana, 2001. 190 p. 13,5 × 21. €12,91 – Lit. 25.000

Salyer, Gary D., *Vain Rhetoric*. Private Insight and Public Debate in Ecclesiastes (JSOTSS 327). Sheffield, Academic Press, 2001. 443 p. 16 × 24. £60.00 – \$95.00

Sanday, William, *Essays in Biblical Criticism and Exegesis*. Selected and Edited by Craig A. Evans and Stanley E. Porter (JSNTSS 225; Classics in Biblical and Theological Studies Supplement Series 2). Sheffield, Academic Press, 2001. 242 p. 16 × 24. £40.00 – \$60.00

Scarpat, Giuseppe, *Parrhesia greca, parrhesia cristiana* (Studi biblici 130). Brescia, Paideia Editrice, 2001. 187 p. 13,5 × 21. Lit. 33.000

Schenker, Adrian, *Knecht und Lamm Gottes (Jesaja 53)*. Übernahme von Schuld im Horizont der Gottesknechtslieder (SBS 190). Stuttgart, Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk GmbH, 2001. 131 p. 13,5 × 21. €20,35 – DM 39,80 – ÖS 291 – SFr 38

ISSN 0006-0887

This periodical is indexed in the ATLA Religion Database, published by the American Theological Library Association, 250 S. Wacker Dr., 16th Flr., Chicago, IL 60606.
E-mail: atla@atla.com. <http://www.atla.com/>

PIETRO BOCCACCIO, Direttore Responsabile

Autorizz. Tribunale di Roma n. 6229 del 24-3-1958 del Reg. della Stampa



Associato all'Unione Stampa Periodica Italiana

Finito di stampare il 1° marzo 2002

Tip. «Don Bosco» – Via Prenestina, 468 – 00171 Roma